DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 108 231 CS 202 116

AUTHOR Bishop, J. Dean, Ed.; And Others
TITLE A Symposium in Rhetoric (Texas Women's University, Denton, Texas, April 26, 1974).
INSTITUTION Federation of North Texas Area Universities.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 63p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Composition (Literary); Conference Reports; Creative Writing; Higher Education; Linguistics; *Literary Styles; *Rhetoric

ABSTRACT

The papers in this book were presented at a Symposium in Rhetoric at the Texas Woman's University, in Denton, Texas, on April 26, 1974. "Searching for a Romantic Rhetoric" by Gary Tate argues that authors of textbooks have failed the contemporary student of writing by ignoring the spaciousness of rhetoric. Rhetoric has also served writing students poorly by failing to incorporate rhetorical theory into practice. Finally, there is a growing danger in the way in which rhetoricians have rediscovered the idea of appealing to one's audience. "The Value of Rhetoric to the Creative Artist" by Winston Weathers argues that rhetoric as a prelude to creative writing and as an attitude and methodology in the teaching of creative writing would be valuable. "Rhetoric and Linguistics" by Turner Kobler compares these two fields. "Rhetoric, Whether Goest Thou? by Edward P.J. Corbett discusses the future of rhetoric. (TS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED108231

A SYMPOSIUM IN RHETORIC

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Edited by
J. Dean Bishop
Turner S. Kobler
William E. Tanner

CS202 1/16

A Symposium in Rhetoric

This volume is dedicated to

Dr. Autrey Nell Wiley

who as

Professor of English

Chairman of the Department of English

Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

designed and first directed

the doctoral program in rhetoric

at the Texas Woman's University

A Symposium in Rhetoric

Edited by
J. Dean Bishop
Turner S. Kobler
William E. Tanner

Table of Contents

Foreword 1

Searching for a Romantic Rhetoric
Gary Tate 5

Contemporary Concepts of Literary Style
James R. Bennett 11

The Value of Rhetoric to the Creative Artist
Winston Weathers 25

Rhetoric and Linguistics
Turner Kobler 34

Rhetoric, Whether Goest Thou?
Edward P. J. Corbett 44

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Committee for the Federation Degree TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Program in English of the Federation of TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY North Texas Area Universities TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright 1975 by the Committee for the Federation Degree Program in English of the Federation of North Texas Area Universities

Printed at the Texas Woman's University Print Shop

Foreword

The papers in this book were presented at A Symposium in Rhetoric at the Texas Woman's University, in Denton, Texas, on April 26, 1974. The Symposium, "Rhetoric: 1974," was a project of the Federation of North Texas Area Universities, which includes East Texas State University in Commerce and North Texas State University and the Texas Woman's University in Denton. With the cooperation of the supporting universities, the Symposium was conceived and planned by the faculty of the Department of English at TWU in accord with its doctoral program, which provides a concentration in rhetoric.

The Federation joins the graduate programs of the three area universities, enabling each to provide not only a richer curriculum but more extracurricular scholarly activities for its graduate students than would be possible separately. The 1974 committee for the Federation Degree Program in English included Lavon B. Fulwiler, Chairman, and Eleanor James and Dean Bishop, all of TWU; Thomas A. Perry, of East Texas State; and Jackson E. White, of North Texas State. The planning committee for this symposium was directed by Dean Bishop and included Turner Kobler and William E. Tanner, all of TWU.

Four distinguished rhetoricians from off-campus and one TWU faculty member were invited to participate in the one-day meeting; all of the papers are printed here. At the first session, Edward P. J. Corbett, of the Ohio State University, served as moderator. Essays were read on "Rhetoric and the Contemporary Student," by Gary Tate of Texas Christian University; on "Rhetoric and Style," by James R. Bennett of the University of Arkansas; on "Rhetoric and the Creative Artist," by Winston Weathers of the University of Tulsa; and on "Rhetoric and Linguistics," by Turner Kobler of the Texas Woman's University. A question-and-answer session, led by doctoral candidates from TWU, followed.

At the evening meeting, Professor Corbett delivered the principal address: "Rhetoric, Whether Goest Thou?" The Exordium was delivered by Leslie R. Kreps, Vice President for Academic Affairs at TWU, and Narratios were presented by Fred Tarpley, Chairman of the Department of Literature and Languages of East Texas State, and by Lavon B. Fulwiler, Chairman of the Department of English at TWU.

The Symposium, to be repeated in April of 1975, was funded and encouraged by the Federation because of the increasing public and scholarly interest in rhetoric in the Southwest. As Dr. Kreps remarked in the Exordium:

"We are proud of this Symposium because, as part of the Federation of North Texas Area Universities, we at the Texas Woman's University are participating in a particular type of consortium effort in graduate education. There are many different Federation programs. In some of them all three of the universities grant the degree. In others, two do, and in a few, one university grants the degree. The program in English with a concentration in rhetoric is the one program in which TWU is the degree-granting institution and the other two members of the Federation are in supporting roles. So we are very proud of this program and the Symposium which is being held here."

Speaking of the revival of interest in rhetoric, Dr. Kreps continued: "Long I had commiserated with certain of my colleagues in the field of English that if they had kept a firmer hold on rhetoric, we in the speech profession would probably never have been born; we would probably have continued to be a part of the field of English, as it was early in this century. And maybe I wouldn't have gotten into the field of classical rhetoric. But that was the reason it was such a pleasure when I came to this University to see plans

well under way for a rather strong reclaiming, not only in terms of individual professional effort but in terms of degree offerings, of the field of rhetoric in the Department of English. I was glad to have a part in the planning and the preparation of the program .... Now I am glad to see students finishing the program and scholarly meetings such as this being sponsored. In such a setting it is essential to stress that rhetoric should have a rebirth of emphasis not only at the Texas Woman's University but nationwide. Especially important is a re-emphasis on the rhetorical principles stressed by the great classical rhetoricians: by Isocrates, by Aristotle, by Cicero, by Quintilian.

"Today, if we are going to express our ideas clearly and persuasively, whether we are a speech teacher, an English teacher, or a bridge builder, we are going to have to recapture the classical emphasis on rhetoric .... The classical emphasis can give the students with whom we work some tools with which they can meet the communication challenges they face. Because it doesn't matter, as Aristotle said, whether you are a bridge builder or a statesman, you have to be a rhetorician as well. Truth, wherever it is found, needs the energizing that comes through the application of sound principles of rhetoric. It is a challenging thing to do, a great subject to teach."

It is in the interest of that great and challenging subject that the editors present this volume and dedicate it to the fine scholar who conceived of and designed the doctoral program in English with a concentration in rhetoric for the Texas Woman's University: Dr. Autrey Nell Wiley.

In a Narratio to the evening program, Dr. Lavon B. Fulwiler paid this tribute:

"Dr. Autrey Nell Wiley, former Chairman of the Department of English and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences of the Texas Woman's University, thought of rhetoric—as we who are involved in the Federated Degree Program in English today think of it—as an excellent co-ordinating force for the several basic issues in the teaching of English and indeed of various humanities. In our field in particular, rhetoric is a link unifying the teaching of composition, the teaching of literature, the teaching of language."

Out of a vision of rhetoric as co-ordinator, Dr. Wiley began thinking of "a special English program providing a focus on rhetoric.

Consequently she designed and instituted an excellent and a workable—a very pragmatic as well as a very inspiring—program for which all of us enjoying participation in it today are genuinely grateful," Dr. Fulwiler continued.

"Dr. Wiley is interested in the Federation of North Texas Area Universities. She is interested in our colleagues at East Texas State University and North Texas State University. She is interested in the Department of English as in the entire Texas Woman's University. And so one purpose of my narratio has been to present facts about Dr. Wiley's efforts in the establishment of the doctoral degree program in English with a concentration in rhetoric. I wish also to give special recognition to Dr. Wiley for her scholarly vision, her foresight, in planning this truly innovative program; to commend her for her very able initiation of the program, which was indeed approved as a program operating under the Federation of North Texas Area Universities; and to express publicly our sincere appreciation of her dedication."

J. Dean Bishop
Turner S. Kobler
William E. Tanner
and
Lavon B. Fulwiler
Consultant

Searching for a Romantic Rhetoric

I speak to you today not as a rhetorician – I am not one – but as a teacher of writing who is interested in rhetoric in the same way that he is interested in linguistics, psychology, and literature. I am interested in these various disciplines only insofar as they help me help my students compose better English prose. In another role on another day, I would also argue for the intrinsic value of these disciplines; but today I am interested in them only as they serve my needs as a teacher of composition.

I want to talk with you briefly about how well contemporary students and teachers of composition have been served by rhetoric, by its theorists, and by writers of textbooks. My thesis is simple: we have been poorly served in a number of ways, four of which I would like to comment on this afternoon.

But first I want to emphasize that I am not condemning all rhetoricians, all writers of textbooks. Counterexamples to what I say can certainly be found. What I am interested in is what seem to be widespread tendencies in both theory and practice. It may be, of course, that I am reading the wrong books, perusing the wrong journals, watching the wrong classes. But I think not.

The first way in which authors of textbooks have failed the contemporary student of writing is by ignoring the spaciousness of rhetoric, by concentrating almost solely upon anemic, emasculated versions of rhetorical principles and processes. If rhetoric is what I think it is – the search for truth and the means of making our discoveries available – then it has not got into the composition textbooks, into the thinking of teachers. Can you imagine a teacher of composition telling his students that the semester is to be spent searching for truths? His students would be amused, perplexed, even angry: "But I enrolled in this class to learn how to write!" Can you imagine a teacher treating the outline as a way of searching for the truth? Of course not. We are too interested in the student's

getting the capital letters and Roman numerals in the right places. Truth must wait while we attend to topic sentences, paragraph development, and "correct" diction. These are not unworthy topics, but they are of interest only as a means of getting at the truth of a subject. I would argue that diction, for example, is of primary importance not because of its effect upon the reader but because different words tell different stories, different words reveal different truths – or those approximations of truth discovered by the writer. A search for a better word is a search for a better vision.

I am not here to attach blame to individuals, books, or traditions. But it is sad that writers of composition textbooks have been so heavily influenced by those rhetoricians who view rhetoric as concerned almost solely with the techniques of speaking and writing – in other words, with rhetoric as a formal art, a methodological art. Form and method are important, but substance must not be ignored. Let us never forget that rhetoric is also a substantive art.

Rhetoric has also served the contemporary student of writing poorly by subjecting him to books that talk about rhetorical theory but fail to incorporate that theory into practice. What I am lamenting is the absence of composition books which incorporate all the available and relevant ideas from such books at Kinneavy's *A Theory of Discourse*, Corder's *Uses of Rhetoric*, Young, Becker, and Pike's *Rhetoric: Discovery and Change*, and Corbett's *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. Each of these has been available for a number of years, Corbett's since 1965, Corder's and Kinneavy's since 1971. Each has had wide circulation among teachers of composition and writers of textbooks, yet their influence has been minimal. Something of classical rhetoric as revitalized by Corbett creeps into some texts, but there is, as far as I know, very little if any of Young, Becker, and Pike's fine work on invention, nothing of Kinneavy's aims of discourse, and no hint of that spacious view of rhetoric taken by Corder. And unfortunately, none of these four books – or others which you might wish to add – is ideally suited for use in college composition classes, although Corbett's book has been rather widely used in such classes.

We have today, in the relationship between rhetoric and the teaching of composition, much the same situation that has existed for several years in the relationship between linguistics and the teaching of composition. First there is theory construction – the work of Chomsky, for example. Then we have books that talk about linguistic theories, usually simplifying them for beginning students.

The next step is to incorporate into writing textbooks a chapter or two on linguistics, most typically transformational analysis. But with only a few exceptions, no one has really transformed the theories into practical advice for the young writer. The major exceptions are two or three recent books on sentence combining techniques which use a transformational base. Such a pattern — theory construction, popularization, incorporation — can be seen although not quite so neatly, in the recent revival of interest in rhetoric. Theories have been revived or constructed; books popularizing these theories have been written — I am not using *popularize* in a pejorative sense — but just as with linguistics, there has been very little incorporation of theory into composition textbooks. One obvious example of what might be done comes to mind. Kinneavy's aims of discourse categories — reference discourse, persuasive discourse, literary discourse, and expressive discourse — might well form the basis for a collection of illustrative readings. A reader organized according to these categories would be immensely useful in writing classes of all kinds. Yet none has appeared. And so composition students are deprived of the valuable insights of Kinneavy, just as they are deprived of the insights of other rhetoricians who are doing exciting work today.

What I am asking for may be difficult, but not, I think, impossible. I ask for textbooks which show young writers how to search for the truth and how to communicate what they find. I ask for textbooks which do more than repeat in slightly different formats what William Irmscher has called the "cliches of our profession."

What better job for a rhetorician than to make available to a large and hungry audience the finest insights of his discipline. But he needs to do more than just talk about rhetorical theory. He must incorporate that theory into a well-designed, well-structured writing program.

My third point is that the contemporary student has been poorly served because of the tendency of rhetoricians to construct models — models of the inventive process, models for talking about style, models for arrangement. The construction of models is by now a well-established procedure in the sciences and social sciences, and it is understandable why rhetoricians have adopted this approach. After all, it is argued, we cannot observe directly the workings of the mind during the inventive process or during those times when stylistic choices are being made. Therefore, all we can

do is construct models. A model is an abstraction — a formula, diagram, set of rules — that will enable us to do on paper what human beings do in their heads and along their nervous systems. This procedure has produced interesting results, but I am too much of a romantic not to wish that more attention be given the suffering, loving, hating, successful writer. To abstract and intellectualize the passions of a writer into models is a sport for mandarin intellectuals, not for those who face several rooms full of freshmen every week, semester after semester, year in and year out.

We should not give up constructing models. Many operations of the mind and of the heart cannot be observed directly, but subjective analysis and intuition are still available to us. We can pay attention more than we do to our own minds and hearts in action as we compose. And if we watch carefully, being always alert to our inward motions, we may occasionally catch a glimpse of something real happening, something that we had thought could only be talked of abstractly, in terms of a model, a set of rules, a mechanical process.

One example. Invention has attracted a good deal of attention in recent years. We have rediscovered the classical topics, and we have developed pre-writing procedures ranging from meditation to journal keeping. We now have Richard Young's "nine-cell search procedure," and we have available a fairly substantial number of journal articles on the topic of invention. What bothers me about all this work is its artificiality. It seems to me that most of those working in the area of invention have given up entirely observing writers at work, observing themselves as writers. In no other area of rhetoric is the model held in higher esteem. I contend, however, that there is still something — maybe a great deal — to be learned from paying attention to real people, including ourselves, inventing and writing.

This semester I started my freshman composition course with a section on assertions and support — a very traditional, ordinary sort of topic, although I had never spent several weeks on just this subject alone. In preparing to teach the assertion-support unit I looked at a large number of composition textbooks to see what was written about this topic. Almost without exception the reader was told either to find supporting facts and details — period — or he was told to look at his experiences, his reading, to see whether supporting evidence could be found. Dissatisfied with all this rather cavalier advice, knowing that in the past it had proved to

be of little help to students, I began to think about my own writing. I pretended I was a student being asked – as my students were asked – to make an assertion, something I believed in, and then to support it. I wrote down several assertions – easy work for an English teacher who loves to make pronouncements – and then I began to support each one. That was when I realized that my support did not come as a result of my looking around for facts and evidence, but as a result of my turning inward and asking one simple question: what in my past experiences has led me to believe the assertions I have made? This realization that the support for an assertion can often be found by asking, "Why do I believe this?" enabled me to help my students in a way that I had never been able to. The results were startling. Some students found excellent supporting evidence as a result of their questioning; others found that they really had no solid reasons for holding an opinion or belief. This last group made profitable discoveries about the shabby quality of their beliefs. But I am not so interested in detailing for you the success of this class as I am in pointing out that no abstract models were used – just a simple examination of the process of opinion formation in ordinary students. It is this kind of attention to the process of composing that I am calling for this afternoon.

Finally, I think there is a growing danger in the way in which rhetoricians have re-discovered or have emphasized anew the whole business of appealing to one's audience. As this interest has been translated into composition textbooks it often smacks of tricks for manipulating one's readers. McCrimmon, in his ever popular *Writing with a Purpose*, tells the student, "Writing is not good or bad in itself, but as it succeeds or fails in getting the response intended." Not a word about fidelity to facts, honesty, truthfulness. Only getting the right response. This is advertising mentality!

I am not arguing for the abandonment of the concept of audience, but I do ask the question: how do we protect ourselves and our students from developing an amoral attitude about the limits to be observed when one begins to work on the audience's fears and hopes and longings? It is well that we attend to the realistic view that real writers write for real people, but we should always keep in mind – as teachers – that there are limits – or should be – to how we teach students to manipulate their readers. Unless we convey this sense of limitation to our students, they will, in one more way, be poorly served by rhetoric.

I do not intend to condemn rhetoric or the study of rhetoric. It is a noble pursuit which should be the unifying ingredient in all

higher education. What better definition of education is there than the one I gave for rhetoric: the search for truth and the means of making what we find available to others. Rhetoric should be the basic ingredient in any composition class, but it should be a spacious rhetoric, not the watered-down versions currently so popular. A rhetoric for the composition student should also incorporate the latest discoveries, whenever these discoveries will serve the student by helping him write better. And if a rhetoric for the student of writing stresses – as it should – the concept of audience, then it should also stress the essential ethics of rhetoric, the morality of rhetoric. Finally, I would call for a rhetoric that is based as closely as possible on the actual composing process of human beings as they write, a rhetoric that is not based entirely on models of the writing process.

If my desire for spaciousness, morality, and subjectivity seems romantic, if the rhetoric I seek seems romantic, then let it be so. The scientific desire for objectivity, exactness, and precision should be honored; but the romance of the word endures.

Gary Tate
Texas Christian University

Contemporary Concepts of Literary Style

Linguistic Stylistics

The domain of literary criticism has traditionally embraced the description, interpretation, and evaluation of texts, and, through the texts, authors, genres, and periods. In recent years, however, the description of texts has expanded and sharpened tremendously through the influence of linguistics. So powerful, in fact, has become the desire to make the description of literary devices a science, that many students of the subject consider the study of devices a branch of linguistic science, confined to their analysis and classification. The history of linguistics, it is important to recall, has experienced a shift of emphasis from the diachronic study of linguistic origins and change to the synchronic study of universal laws, or structural linguistics. The methods of structural linguistics are being applied to all aspects of literature. From genres to prosody, literature is being examined by the analogy of language. Underlying this scientific trend is a distinct conception of style: style is styles, or rather style is elements or features of styles. We call this empirically and linguistically oriented discipline stylistics.

It follows that if style is devices, then stylistics needs not a methodology but methodologies. Thus stylistics today multifariously seeks to gather maximal information about techniques and to develop precise methods for deriving that information. Instead of asking: What is style? modern linguistic stylisticians ask: What are the properties of a text? and What is the best analytical instrument for accurately examining each property? The goal may vary — to describe meter more precisely, to classify narratives more systematically — but the contemporary linguistic stylistician is primarily concerned with developing the best tool for the description of each feature.

This empirical attitude seems bedrock to any reliable effort to discover what an author meant. Science, however, is not directionless observation, nor stylistics random inventories. Critics probably always work on the basis of some conceptual framework, and a concept conditions the critical model and therefore what is perceived: style is ornament, style is idiosyncrasy, style is vision, style is conscious choice, style is unconscious choice, style is deviation from norms, style is selection from pre-existing language varieties, style is content, and so on. And as we have noted, linguistic stylistics does follow a basic concept – style is text features. But linguistic stylistics has the great advantage of concentrating upon quantitative fact and systematic methodology. Clear of the metaphysics of abstract definitions of style, it is better prepared to cope with abstractions. And the accumulation of empirical data through systematic analysis of the numerous style-features admits any concept or practical model safely, not merely because sufficient evidence suppresses bias, but because sufficient categories of text-features ensure sufficient (if not perfect) analytical models.

It should be clear, then, that discussion of concepts of style, from the point of view of linguistic stylistics, means descriptive methodologies of prosody or metaphor or syntax or semantics or structure and so on. I cannot examine all of the recent developments in each of the elements of style, obviously. (See the attached classification of stylistic concepts and methods for further reading.) But I can select a few notable contributions to the understanding of various features of a text, which also illustrate the taxonomic and typological passion characteristic of the exponents of a scientific stylistics. To suggest the range, I have selected three areas of attention: (1) registers, (2) narrative, (3) meter.

1. Functional Styles (Registers, Varieties)

Every educated speaker of English is multilingual in the sense of knowing how to use the large varieties of language available. A variety is a related set of language choices identified as a subsystem within the language as a whole. It is a style of linguistic performance appropriate to a certain situation. Simply, certain situations produce certain utterances. This condition of our language has recently received increasingly systematic analysis. I. R. Galperin (*Stylistics*) distinguishes five functional styles: 1) belles-lettres (poetry, emotive prose, and drama); 2) publicistic (oratory, essays, journal, and newspaper articles); 3) newspaper (headlines, news, and advertisements); 4) scientific (humanistic and exact); and 5) official

documents (commercial, diplomatic, legal, and military). Crystal and Davy (*Investigating English Style*) are much more systematic, beginning with eight dimensions of variation (individuality, dialect, time, discourse, province, status, modality, and singularity), and then examining five varieties in detail: 1) conversation, 2) unscripted commentary, 3) religious utterance, 4) newspaper reporting, and 5) legal documents. Further varieties are suggested in their final chapter. The work on functional styles is still in the preliminary stages. Firm distinctions among the various subsystems await fuller objective data.

2. Narrative

Structural linguistics stopped at the sentence. People like Roland Barthes seek to go beyond the sentence to the laws of discourse (sentence linkage). In this approach, on the analogy of language each piece of literature is a structure, and all literary works form a vast system of structures. "Narrative discourse is an ensemble of sentences organized according to laws higher than those of linguistics but homologous to them. Narrative is a secondary system, a 'Giant Sentence' built as an order of smaller sentences but whose sense is not reduceable to these sentences."[1] What are these laws? Every narrative contains four basic variables: speaker, speech event, participants, and narrated event. Every narrative is governed by rules of causality, temporality, and spatialization. Andrew derives the following table from Jakobson's *Shifters, Verbal Categories, and the Russian Verb*:

	Participant involved		Participant not involved	
	The Term	Term in its Relation	The Term	Term in its Relation
Non-shifter:	pn	pnEn	En	EnEn
Shifter:	pn/ps	pnEn/ps	En/En	EnEns/Es

(Symbols: E, event; p, agent; n, narration; s, speech; shifters are indicators of point of view, e.g. "I"[2]) I cannot go into these terms here but the model illustrates again the linguist's drive for systemization and logical procedure in search of laws. Like a sentence, a story can be diagrammed. One can see immediately the importance of this method to genre, and in fact some critics look forward to the eventual creation of a scientific typology of narrative and other types.

3. Meter

The inadequacy of the traditional iambic-trochaic, stressed-unstressed method of describing meter has long been recognized.

Recent linguistic metrical analysis has increased our understanding of meter significantly. We may distinguish two groups of linguistic metrical analysis: structuralist and generative. One, identified with Trager-Smith (*Outline of English Structure*) and Epstein and Hawkes (*Linguistics and English Prosody*), treats stress in four degrees (primary, secondary, tertiary, and weak), a system which recognizes the complexity of stress and pitch in English, dependent as it is upon phonological environment. There are ten kinds of iambs to choose from in each foot by this system, and some 100,000 differently scanning pentameter lines – and more if junctures (pauses) are included! The other group originated in 1966 with Halle and Keyser's "Chaucer and the Study of Prosody," which started a continuing debate. The issues are intricate indeed, but the Halle-Keyser position is essentially that stress can be determined lexically or linguistically, instead of phonologically, thus permitting the generation of rules. Critics of their system have generally applauded the effort to bring order out of the chaos of the study of prosody, but have sought to improve the rules. Developments continue, and although some of the results are debatable, application of recent linguistic research is certain to heighten one's prosodic awareness distinctively.

Literary Stylistics

I have been describing what seems to me the unique contribution of linguistic stylistics – the systematic analysis of features of language as they contribute to the meaning of a text. No one doubts the enormous value of this work in clarifying our understanding of literature. But I want to propose a second stylistics, which I will call literary stylistics. Stylistics is first of all the systematic description of the constituents of a text. But there is another or a second stage – the systematic description of the interaction of the constituents of an artistic whole. This is the second main domain of contemporary stylistics. This province of the "New Critics" of the thirties and forties – the concern for total compositional design – is obviously not new. But thanks to linguistic stylistics the data is increasingly available for a more precise understanding of what is literary unity.

Reuben Brower in *The Fields of Light* represents the intuitive and common sense critics who have shown the way to a meaningful literary stylistics. Brower conceives of a work of art as "imaginatively organized," that is, as possessing "extraordinary relationships" (grammatical, logical, chronological, imaginal, dramatic, metaphorical, rhythmic, etc.). His method is basically what is recently

labeled paradigmatic but without overlooking the syntagmatic. He seeks the full and exact definition of words by context, compares similar expressions in the text, "tracing the continuities," and then relates the constituent designs in search of "the wonderful and mysterious experience of almost simultaneously perceiving many sets of relationships," which is the unique experience of imaginative literature. But linguists have also understood the fundamental importance of the whole text, the parts interrelated to produce its impact on the reader. Roman Jakobson's model[3] for holistic analysis offers an ultimate meeting place for linguistic and literary stylisticians:

	Context Referential	
Addresser (Factor) Emotive (Function)	Message Poetic	Addressee Conative
	Contact Phatic	
	Code Metalingual	

By this system both linguistic and literary stylisticians are reminded simultaneously of the complex reality that is literature and of their responsibility to help release that reality. The top word of each pair describes the factors involved in verbal communication. "The *addresser* sends a *message* to the *addressee*. To be operative the message requires a context referred . . ., seizable by the addressee, and either verbal or capable of being verbalized; a *code* fully, or at least partially, common to the addresser and addressee . . .; and, finally, a *contact*, a physical channel and psychological connection between the addresser and the addressee, enabling both of them to enter and stay in communication."[4] The bottom word of each pair describes the function of each factor, and the set of paired constituents dramatizes what is involved in the elusive experience of the network of language that is literary art. His holistic model operates as a challenge and a corrective to critics preoccupied with one or a few features of a work of art.

Although it does not follow specifically the model described just now, Jakobson's analysis of Blake's "Infant Sorrow" does follow the spirit of his model. This essay evokes the "total attitude" Brower considers fundamental to literary art, but tracing the multiple levels of symmetry in the poem. The only difference between Brower and Jakobson (both use the phrase "network of words" to

describe a poem) is Jakobson's greater technical facility, which enables him to observe, for example, that odd couplets of the poem differ from the even ones in the structure of their rimes: "Both riming words of any odd couplet belong to the same morphological category, end with the identical consonantal inflectional suffix, and are devoid of agreement in their prevocalic phonemes."[5] Following a paradigmatic analysis of the "global symmetries," Jakobson moves into a syntagmatic analysis of the "dramatic development," the "startling dynamism in the development of the tragic theme" expressed in linguistic terms.

Literary Stylistics (Rhetoric and Speech Acts)

Yet in spite of their critical wholeness, both Brower and Jakobson tend to concentrate on verbal details of the work of art. M. H. Abrams in *The Mirror and the Lamp* distinguishes four critical traditions of the purpose of literature since Aristotle: mimetic (represent reality), pragmatic (teach and please), expressive (inner feelings of author), and objective (beauty of artifact). Both Brower and Jakobson work in the objective tradition; they concentrate upon the message. That is why the tradition of rhetoric – defined as the relationship between the writer and his audience – and the recent closely related concept of "speech acts" offer a needed corrective. The rhetorical tradition of literary studies, by concentrating squarely on the pragmatic and mimetic functions, provides a significant framework for stylistics.

Rhetoricians, by maintaining their attention on the addresser-addressee relationship, perpetuate the social function of literature. In contrast, preoccupation with the artist and the artifact removes literature from its social bearings. Donald C. Bryant ("Rhetoric: Its Function and Its Scope") defines rhetoric as "the rationale of informative and suasory discourse." More pointedly he describes it as "the intentional, directional energizing of truth (mimetic), of finding in any given situation all the available means of persuasion (pragmatic)."[6] Although Bryant tends to delimit the field of rhetoric to reasoned discourse intended to inform public opinion and recognizes the complexity involved in the issue of what a novel or poem is intended to do to an audience, he concludes, I think properly, that the rationales "rhetoric" and "poetic" (stylistics) "have had an irresistible tendency to come together, and their similarities may well be more important than their differences."[7] The rhetorician is concerned, that is, with all the terms of Jakobson's holistic model, but with an emphasis upon addresser-message-addressee. This domain of "the technique of disclosure addressed to

the enlightenment and persuasion of the generality of mankind" offers a significant context for stylisticians, by which their work might transcend mere technique.

A new theory of the relationship of addresser-message-addressee has come in aid of rhetoric: it is called "speech acts." The proponents of this theory, by their stress upon utterances as performances or actions, insist upon a complex set of responsibilities in speaking or writing. Their tri-partite analytical model crystallizes the basic rhetorical relationship of addresser-message-addressee:

1) locutionary acts (message: grammatical structures with meanings);
2) illocutionary acts (function of each structure vis-a-vis addresser-addressee);
3) perlocutionary acts (impact on addressee).

The value of this schema to the stylistician is identical to that of the rhetorician: it confirms the social context of the study of literature.

Max Black warns us against trivial stylistics in *The Morality of Scholarship*:

> Modern literature, history, and analytic philosophy seem only to confirm the congenial relativism and nihilism that students bring to the study of these "humanities." Too often abetted by teachers who are equally perplexed, they readily turn to safe questions of style, or to anything else that falls within the scope of "objective scholarship." The sacred autonomy of art and science becomes a pretext for converting what still claims ... to be "an improvement of the intelligence, and especially the intelligence as it touches the moral life," into an entertaining game, dissociated from the problems of conduct, the ordering of the good life, and the individual's relationship to society.[8]

The domains of rhetoric and speech acts remind us, in the words of Richard Ohmann, that "Style borders on, and overlaps with, action."

James R. Bennett
University of Arkansas

NOTES

[1]J. D. Andrew, " The Structuralist Study of Narrative: Its History, Use, and Limits," *MMLA Bulletin*, 6, No. 1 (Spring 1973), 48.

[2]Andrew, p. 49.

[3]Roman Jakobson, "Concluding Statement: Linguistics and Poetics," *Style in Language*, ed. Thomas Sebeok, 1960, p. 353.

[4]Jakobson, p. 357.

[5]Jakobson, "On the Verbal Art of William Blake and Other Poet-Painters," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 1 (1970), 3.

[6]Donald C. Bryant, "Rhetoric: Its Function and Its Scope," *QJS*, 39 (1953), 180.

[7]Bryant, p. 210.

[8]Max Black, *The Morality of Scholarship*, 1969, p. vi.

STYLISTIC DOMAINS: A CHECKLIST

(entries in chronclogical order)

A. Definitions of Style

Sayce, R. A. "The Definition of the Term 'Style,' " *Proceedings of the Third Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association*, 1962.

Enkvist, Nils. "On Defining Style," in *Linguistics and Style*, ed. John Spencer, 1964.

Chatman, Seymour. "The Semantics of Style," *Social Science Information*, 6 (1967), 77-99; "Stylistics: Quantitative and Qualitative," *Style*, 1 (1967), 29-43.

Kaplan, Milton. "Style is Content," *EJ*, 57 (1968), 1330-34.

Kuenetz, P. "Modern Trends in Anglo-American Stylistics," *Le Langue Francais*, 3 (1969), 85-89.

Schaper, Eva. "The Concept of Style: The Sociologist's Key to Art," *BJA*, 9 (1969), 246-57.

B. Stylistics as a Branch of Linguistic Science

Stylistics the systematic inventory and analysis of the abstract categories of which any text may be constituted.

Saha, P. K. "A Linguistic Approach to Style," *Style*, 2 (1968), 7-31.

Bergal, Irene and James R. Bennett. "Tzvetan Todorov: An Annotated List of His Published Writings in French and English," *Style*, 8 (1974), 139-42.

Bennett, James R. "Todorov and the Structuralist Science of Poetics," *Bucknell Rev.* (forthcoming).

Carson, Julie. "Proper Stylistics," *Style*, 8 (1974), 290-304.

C. Stylistics as a Branch of Literary Criticism

1. Holistic or Contextual: the Coherence of Individual Texts

Brower, Reuben. *The Fields of Light*, 1951.

Jakobson, Roman. "Concluding Statement: Linguistics and Poetics," in *Style in Language*, ed. Thomas Sebeok, 1960.

Spencer, John and Michael Gregory. "An Approach to the Study of Style," in *Linguistics and Style*, ed. John Spencer, 1964.

Riffaterre, Michael. "Stylistic Context," in *Essays on the Language of Literature*, eds. Chatman & Levin, 1967.

Corbett, E. P. J. "A Method of Analysing Prose Style with ... *A Modest Proposal,*" in *Contemporary Essays on Style*, eds. Love and Payne, 1969.

Crystal, David and Derek Davy. *Investigating English Style*, 1969.

Jakobson, Roman. "On the Verbal Art of William Blake and Other Poet-Painters," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 1 (1970), 3-25.

Perrine, Laurence. "The Art of Total Relevance," *The CEA Critic*, 36 (Nov. 1973), 6-12.

D'Angelo, Frank. "Style as Structure," *Style*, 8 (1974), 322-364.

Ludwig, Jay. "Shakespearean Decorum: An Essay on *The Winter's Tale*," *Style*, 8 (1974), 365-404.

2. Author Style

Ohmann, Richard. *Shaw: The Style and the Man*, 1962.

Davis, Robert. "From Artifice to Art: The Technique of Firbank's Novels," *Style*, 2 (1968), 33-47.

Wokenfeld, Jack. *Joyce Cary: The Developing Style*, 1968.

Sayce, R. A. "The Style of Montaigne," in *Literary Style*, ed. Seymour Chatman, 1971.

3. Diachronic (the history of style, period style)

Croll, Morris. "The Baroque Style in Prose (1929)," in *Style, Rhetoric, and Rhythm*, eds. Patrick et al., 1966.

Chambers, R. W. *On the Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to More and His School*, 1932.

Williamson, George. *The Senecan Amble*, 1951.

Scholes, Robert and Robert Kellogg. *The Nature of Narrative*, 1966.

Gordon, Ian. *The Movement of English Prose*, 1966.

Baker, William. *Syntax in English Poetry* 1870-1930, 1967.

Garrett, Peter. *Scene and Symbol from George Eliot to James Joyce*, 1969.

Bennett, James R. *Prose Style: A Historical Approach Through Studies*, 1971.

Zumthor, Paul. "Style and Expressive Register in Medieval Poetry," in *Literary Style*, ed. Seymour Chatman, 1971.

Bennett, James R. and Linda Stafstrom. "English and American Prose Style: A Bibliography of Criticism for 1968-69," *Style*, 7 (1973), 295-348.

Murray, Roger. "Period Style: A Bibliography of Criticism," *Style* (forthcoming).

4. Genre

Frye, Northrop. *The Anatomy of Criticism*, 1957.

Paris, Bernard. "Form, Theme, and Imitation in Realistic Fiction," *Novel*, 1 (1968), 140-49.

Rosenfield, Lawrence. "The Anatomy of Critical Discourse," *SM*, 35 (1968), 50-69.

Shulman, Robert. "The Style of Bellow's Comedy," *PMLA*, 83 (1968), 109-17.

Ikegami, Yoshihiko. "A Linguistic Essay on Parody," *Linguistics*, 55 (1969), 13-31.

Starobinski, Jean. "The Style of Autobiography," in *Literary Style*, ed. Seymour Chatman, 1971.

Bennett, James R. "A Methodological Guide to Articles in *Style* Volumes I-VI," *Style*, 6 (1972), 335-40.

Prince, Gerald. *A Grammar of Stories*, 1973.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *The Fantastic*, 1973.

Lewis, Merrell. "The Style of Historiography," *Style* (forthcoming).

Rewa, Michael. "The Style of Biography," *Style* (forthcoming).

D. Concepts and Methodologies

1. Comparative (the need for a "control" in style studies)

Hayes, Curtis. "A Transformational-Generative Approach to Style: Samuel Johnson and Edward Gibbon," *L&S*, 1 (1968), 39-48.

Craddock, Patricia. "An Approach to the Distinction of Similar Styles: Two English Historians," *Style*, 2 (1968), 105-127.

2. Conscious Choice (including Deviance)

Hill, Archibald. "Some Further Thoughts on Grammaticality and Poetic Language," *Style*, 1 (1967), 81-91.

Levin, Samuel R. "Poetry and Grammaticalness," in *Essays on the Language of Literature*, eds. Seymour Chatman and S. R. Levin, 1967.

Galperin, I. R. *Stylistics*, 1971.

Widdowson, H. G. "On the Deviance of Literary Discourse," *Style*, 6 (1972), 294-308.

Rosengren, Inger. "Style as Choice and Deviation," *Style*, 6 (1972), 3-18.

Chapman, Raymond. *Linguistics and Literature: An Introduction to Literary Stylistics*, 1973.

3. Habitual Usage

Milic, Louis. *A Quantitative Approach to the Style of Jonathan Swift*, 1967, and "Rhetorical Choice & Stylistic Option," in *Literary Style*, ed. Seymour Chatman, 1971.

4. Syntagmatic: sentence by sentence analysis following linear sequence of the text; Paradigmatic: schematization of repeated units to illuminate structural design.

Chapman, Raymond. *Linguistics and Literature*, 1973.

D'Angelo, Frank. "Arrangement: Paradigmatic Analysis," in *A Theory of Conceptual Rhetoric* (forthcoming).

5. Statistics and Style

Dolezel, Lubomir and R. W. Bailey. *Statistics and Style*, 1969.

Wells, Elizabeth. "A Comparative Statistical Analysis of the Prose Styles of F. Scott Fitzgerald and Ernest Hemingway," in *Fitzgerald-Hemingway Annual*, 1969.

6. Rhetorical or Pragmatic: The Writer and His Audience

Bryant, Donald C. "Rhetoric: Its Function and Its Scope," *QJS*, 39 (1953), 401-24.

Booth, Wayne. "The Revival of Rhetoric," *PMLA*, 80 (1965), 8-12.

Leech, G. N. "Linguistics and the Figures of Rhetoric," in *Essays on Style and Language*, ed. R. Fowler, 1966.

Corbett, Edward P. J. "What is Being Revived?" *CCC*, 18 (1967), 166-72.

Lybbert, E. K. and D. W. Cummings. "Rhetorical Syntax, Economy, and the Theme-Rheme Distinction," *L&S*, 2 (1969), 244-56.

Dixon, P. *Rhetoric*, 1971.

7. Speech Acts

Austin, J. L. *How To Do Things With Words*, 1962.

Searle, John. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, 1969.

Ohmann, Richard. "Speech, Action, and Style," in *Literary Style*, ed. Seymour Chatman (1971); "Speech Acts and the Definition of Literature," *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 4 (1971), 1-19; "Instrumental Style: Notes on the Theory of Speech as Action," in *Issues in Linguistics*, ed. Braj Kachru, 1973; "Speech, Literature, and the Space Between," *New Literary History*, 4 (1972), 47-64.

8. Registers (class and language; functional styles: journalistic, scientific, etc.)

Gumperz, John and Dell Hymes, eds. *The Ethnography of Communication*, 1964.

Halliday, M. A. K., A. McIntosh, and P. Strevens. *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching*, 1964.

Leech, G. N. *English in Advertising*, 1966.

Gregory, M. "Aspects of Varieties Differentiation," *Journal of Linguistics*, 3 (1967), 177-98.

Crystal, David and Derek Davy. *Investigating English Style*, 1969.

Galperin, I. R. *Stylistics*, 1971.

Labov, William, *Sociolinguistic Patterns*, 1972.

9. Semantics

Empson, William. *Seven Types of Ambiguity*, 1930, and *The Structure of Complex Words*, 1951.

Ogden, C. K. and I. A. Richards. *The Meaning of Meaning*, 10th ed., 1960.

Ullmann, Stephen. *Semantics*, 1962.

Leech, G. N. *Towards a Semantic Description of English*, 1969.

10. Structural, Paragraph, Narrative Discourse

Levi-Strauss, Claude. "The Structural Study of Myth," in *Myth*, ed. Thomas Sebeok, 1955.

Levin, Samuel R. *Linguistic Structures in Poetry*, 1962.

Harris, Zellig. "Discourse Analysis," in *The Structure of Language*, eds. Jerry Fodor and J. J. Katz, 1964.

Becker, Alton. "A Tagmemic Approach to Paragraph Analysis," *CCC*, 16 (1965), 237-42.

Christensen, Francis. "A Generative Rhetoric of the Paragraph," *CCC*, 16 (1965), 144-56.

Tomashevsky, Boris. "Thematics," in *Russian Formalist Criticism*, tr. Lemon and Reis, 1965.

Anderson, Floyd. "*Dispositio* in the Preaching of Hugh Latimer," *SM*, 35 (1968), 451ff.

Ganzel, Dewey, "*Cabestro* and *Vaquilla*: The Symbolic Structure of *The Sun Also Rises*," *Sewanee Review*, 76 (1968), 26-48.

Propp, V. *Morphology of the Folktale*, 2nd ed., 1968.

Cook, Walter. *Introduction to Tagmemic Analysis*, 1969.

Hendricks, W. O. *Linguistics and the Structural Analysis of Literary Texts*, 1969.

Dolezel, Lubomir. "Toward a Structural Theory of Content in Prose Fiction," in *Literary Style*, ed. Seymour Chatman, 1971.

Grady, Michael. "A Conceptual Rhetoric of the Composition," *CCC*, 22 (1971), 348-54, and "On Teaching Christensen Rhetoric," *EJ*, 61 (1972), 859-73.

Hamon, P. "Narrative Semiotics in France," *Style*, 8 (1974), 34-45.

Andrew, J. D. "The Structuralist Study of Narrative: Its History, Use, and Limits," *MMLA Bulletin*, 6, No. 1 (Spring 1973), 45-61.

11. Syntax

Davie, Donald. *Articulate Energy*, 1955.

Ohmann, Richard. "Generative Grammars and the Concept of Literary Style," *Word*, 20 (1964), 423-39.

Berry, Francis. *Poet's Grammar*, 1965.

Christensen, Francis. "A Generative Rhetoric of the Sentence," in *The Sentence and the Paragraph*, 1966.

Ohmann, Richard. "Literature as Sentences," *CE*, 27 (1966), 261-67.

Di Pietro, Robert. "A Transformational Note on a Few Types of Joycean Sentences," *Style*, 3 (1969), 156-67.

Degenfelder, Pauline. "Yoknapatawphan Baroque: A Stylistic Analysis of *As I Lay Dying*," *Style*, 7 (1973), 121-56.

Smith, William. "Sentence Structure in the Tales of Henry James," *Style*, 7 (1973), 157-72.

Kintgen, Eugene. "Is Transformational Stylistics Useful?" *CE*, 35 (1974), 799-824.

Shopen, Timothy. "Some Contributions from Grammar to the Theory of Style," *CE*, 35 (1974), 775-98.

12. Metaphor and Imagery

Brooke-Rose, Christine. *A Grammar of Metaphor*, 1958.

Hill, Archibald. "Analogies, Icons and Images in Relation to Semantic Content of Discourses," *Style*, 2 (1968), 203-27.

Kaufmann, R. J. "Metaphorical Thinking and the Scope of Literature," *CE*, 30 (1968), 31-47.

Wheelwright, Phillip. *The Burning Fountain*, rev. 1968.

Nemerov, Howard. "On Metaphor," *VQR*, 45 (1969), 621-36.

Owen, Thomas. *Metaphor and Related Subjects*, 1969.

Glaser, Rosemarie. "The Application of Transformational Generative Grammar to the Analysis of Similes and Metaphors in Modern English," *Style*, 5 (1971), 265-83.

13. Content Analysis (patterns of associations)

Sedelow, Sally Y. and Walter A. Sedelow. "Categories and Procedures for Content Analysis in the Humanities," in *The Analysis of Communication Content*, eds. George Gerbner et al., 1969.

Ross, Robert. "Content Analysis: Quantitative Semantics in Literary Studies and Political Science," *Style* (forthcoming).

14. Prosody

a. Structural

Saintsbury, George. *Historical Manual of English Prosody*, 1910.

Epstein, Edmund and T. Hawkes. *Linguistics and English Prosody*, 1959.

Shapiro, Karl and Beum R. *A Prosody Handbook*, 1960.

Chatman, Seymour. *A Theory of Meter*, 1964.

Crystal, David. *Prosodic Systems and Intonation*, 1969.

Fraser, G. S. *Metre, Rhyme and Free Verse*, 1970.

b. Halle-Keyser Debate

Beaver, Joseph. "A Grammar of Prosody," *CE*, 29 (1968), 310-12.

Keyser, Samuel. "The Linguistic Basis of English Prosody," in *Modern Studies in English*, eds. David Reibel and Sanford Shane, 1969.

Magnuson, Karl and Frank Ryder. "The Study of English Prosody: An Alternative Proposal," *CE*, 31 (1970), 780-820.

Wimsatt, W. K. "The Rule and the Norm: Halle and Keyser on Chaucer's Meter," *CE*, 31 (1970), 774-88.

Beaver, Joseph. "Current Metrical Issues," *CE*, 33 (1971), 177-97.

Hewitt, Elizabeth. "Prosody: A Structuralist Approach," *Style*, 6 (1972), 229-59.

15. Propositional Reduction

Milic, Louis. *Stylists on Style*, 1969.

Hiatt, Mary. "Locke on Language Via Propositional Reduction," *Style*, 5 (1971), 384-99.

16. Information Theory

Milic, Louis. *Stylists on Style*, 1969.

17. Coupling

Levin, Samuel R. *Linguistic Structures in Poetry*, 1969.

The Value of Rhetoric to the Creative Artist

If we define rhetoric simply to mean "persuasion," then I'm not sure that rhetoric will be of great value to the creative artist. But if we define rhetoric in a more detailed way, it can perhaps be proposed as a meaningful discipline for the creative minded. By more detailed definition, I mean something like this: "Rhetoric is a sharable systematic knowledge of the ways a communicator can most effectively present what he has to say to a particular audience in order to persuade that audience to give him a hearing, accept him as a communication-intending speaker, recognize and agree to the value of the communication, and respond to the communication in a meaningful way."

Even with that definition, however, rhetoric will not be accepted wholeheartedly by creative people. There is an inevitable resistance on their part to anything that boasts the characteristics of "sharable" and "systematic." Creative persons have a natural aversion to a sharing of their tricks and to a codifying of their habits. To the creative person, rhetoric can look suspiciously like an exposure and an imprisonment, all at once.

The creative person is not simply being perverse, however. On the one hand he usually does have a desire to make some sort of contact with an audience; on the other, he has a desire to express himself in his own terms. And he's caught in a struggle characteristic of all imaginative efforts: to move from the private into the public, from the personal, subjective atmosphere in which the magic of creativity takes place into the community "out there" where the products of creativity must finally exist.

Taking a dim view of rhetoric—retreating fearfully from public artistry in an increasingly materialistic and vulgar age—many artists have in our time developed aesthetics that are blatanly anti-rhetorical. Certainly in the last two hundred years, many creative

artists have argued that art must exist and be evaluated in complete disassociation from audiences; that rather than the artist making accommodations to audiences, audiences must make accommodations to the artist: that the artist's first loyalty is to his own integrity, sincerity, and naturalness, and certainly not to the needs and expectations of audiences; and that any artistry that does attempt to participate in a "sharable systematic knowledge of the ways" is simply to be dismissed as popular, formulaic, and commercial—not to be dealt with in academe or literary-land.

This does not mean, of course, that no rhetoric at all is practiced by creative artists. Even in this generally anti-rhetorical age, some do seriously seek audience reaction—in fact, we sometimes see the artist jabbing, pounding, manhandling audiences in an attempt to manipulate and force-feed. But most of the time any "rhetoric" that is practiced is denied or unacknowledged. Mention the very word "rhetoric"—and the artist will, ninety-nine per cent of the time, deny any such considerations on his part; he will talk about himself and his creative resources or about the art work he has created, but he is not too likely to talk about audiences he is trying to reach. Sometimes, yes. But most of the time, no. And because of the artist's refusal to subscribe openly to a "sharable and systematic knowledge" about reaching audiences, the rhetoric he does occasionally practice is usually inadequate, and marked by ignorance; limited to fellow craftsmen whom he is trying to impress or please, or disastrously diluted to reach some great indistinguishable mass of "people out there." By refusing to recognize rhetoric as a legitimate part of artistry, the creator handicaps himself and, alas, compromises the very role of art in our society.

I, for one, would like to see the restitution of rhetoric into the creative experience—and by restitution, I mean the public acknowledgement of rhetoric and the identification of it as a part of the artist's apprenticeship and training. For rhetoric to be of value to the artist it must be brought out in the open, and our task as rhetoricians is, surely, the publication of rhetoric in that area of discourse—imaginative, creative writing—in which we too often seem to be self-effacing strangers—letting creative writing rest exclusively in the hands of those who maintain it as a mystery cult. Our task as rhetoricians is to convince the artist that he really does have rhetorical intentions the moment he hands his work to someone else to read; that he really does make rhetorical gestures in his work, even nowadays, uncertain and rough as those gestures may be; and

that he has nothing to fear by acknowledging rhetoric as a part of his expertise or by accepting a "sharable and systematic knowledge" as part of his creative competence.

What I would really like to do, of course, is to convince the young, talented writer—standing at the beginning of his career—to use traditional rhetoric as a foundation for his entire creative effort, to study traditional rhetoric in school, prior even to his study of creative writing. I'd like to say something like this to him:

One, if you study traditional rhetoric and grasp its fundamental concern with audiences, you'll be committed to the most productive and meaningful path that a creative writer can follow. With such a commitment, you'll be saved from the alternative—that of circling around and around in the wilderness of your own moods, sensations, joys, and pains; a circling around in which the tremendous energy of your own creativity, unyoked from rhetoric, will lead you into the swamps of solipsism and into the inevitable cult of personality; will lead you finally to the frustrating discovery that audiences, whom you expect to applaud you but with whom you have refused to cooperate, will no longer be listening to anything you have to say but will respond to you only when you dangle your personality in front of them—dangle your life-style, costumes, vital statistics, secret vices; will respond to you only when you parade your wife, children, mistresses, and political comrades in front of them; and will respond to you only as an extra-literary *objet de theatre*, not as a writer, thinker, or serious spokesman of any sort.

A commitment to rhetoric will save you from that and will help you maintain an effective relationship with audiences who—because of your very practice of rhetoric—will be encouraged to enter into intellectual and emotional transactions with your works of art. Nor will those transactions mean that you are having to say things that audiences want to hear and with which they agree and that you don't want to say. Some writers resist rhetoric because they fear it means producing, contrary to their own desires, "happy endings," "pat solutions," "false emphases" upon sex or patriotism or such. But actually rhetoric means none of that—rather it is a discipline used, frequently, to make palatable the very things audiences don't want to hear and don't agree with. Rhetoric will be your greatest weapon when you do wish to tell the truth as you see it in the face of what you consider to be the misconceptions of your readers.

Two, if you study traditional rhetoric you will involve yourself in the history of that rhetoric and, as in all studying of history, you will be helped to escape the provincialism of your own particular time and place. Simply by grasping the concern—from ancient Greece to modern America—that man has had for the mysterious relationship of speaker and audience, you will see that your activity as a creative writer is related to and rooted in a tradition, an awareness of which may keep you from wasting a great deal of time in achieving your own delicate balance with reality and the world. It was Reed Whittemore, I believe, who said, in his book *From Zero to the Absolute,* that the greatest mistake of the contemporary artist, especially the contemporary writer, is his insistence upon isolation from the past, in his terrible imprisoning of himself in the present moment, and his subsequent struggle, out of self-maintained ignorance, to re-enact the last three thousand years of civilization, having to discover the word all over again, having to run language, literature, and discourse through all the laboratory experiments again, to insist upon shutting his eyes to everyone from Gorgias to I. A. Richards and saying, "I'm going to figure this all out myself."

The trouble with figuring it all out yourself is that you will stray into all the old booby traps and dead ends of discourse, all the cliches and stereotypes and banalities that have long been charted and identified in rhetorical history. You will write a great deal more bad literature than you ever imagined you would—paying the inevitable price for making your own discoveries about man and the word.

You may argue, of course, that your study of literary history will effect an adequate historical perspective, that your study of Virgil and Shakespeare and Milton and Pope will rescue you from provincialism just as well as the study of traditional rhetoric can. And I would agree. Yet in literary history you will surely discover that, until very recent times, rhetoric was the very preparation for literature and that for you to grasp the real quality of literature you will need to grasp its rhetorical dimensions and bases.

When you realize that out of the total number of creative writers in the history of Western civilization, seventy-five per cent were either trained in rhetoric or lived in societies in which rhetoric was the major educational subject, then you may begin to see that in the larger scheme of things literature and rhetoric are inseparable. Indeed, the study of rhetoric can rescue you from a limited notion of what literature is all about, what part it plays in the social order, and what expertise produces it.

Three, if you do escape the solipsistic and provincial attitude of the non-rhetorical writer, you will have achieved a critical liberation that will be of tremendous value to you. You will discover that you have stronger, more realistic criteria for the judgment of literature—not only the literature written by others, but also that which you attempt to write yourself.

You will judge literature—not in terms of authorial personality and [illegible]stique, or in terms of the isolated work of art—but in terms of audience reception and reaction. You will discover that the question is not, Is this a good novel? but, Is this a good novel for this audience? or For what audience will this novel best work? You will reject that criticism—prevalent in our times certainly—that re-enacts the fairy tale, "The Emperor's New Clothes," in its insistence that what we really see, or feel, or think as audiences has nothing to do with an evaluation of what is there. You will reject the criticism that says a work of literature can be evaluated prior to its presentation to an audience. Rather your criticism will consider how a work of literature reaches its readers, how it proceeds to talk with its readers, how it relates to or negotiates with its readers. And you will realize, in your striving to meet critical standards, that while your non-rhetorical fellow student is spending his energies discovering and establishing his "voice"—you can perhaps more profitably spend your energies discovering the psychological and emotional dimensions of readers, the nature of their "ears," their literary capacities, so that you can adapt your voices to their ability to listen and understand. Nor will you—once you have your own critical eyes set upon the critical goal of audience reaction—be diverted by artificial and alien standards maintained somewhere aloft in heaven or the *New York Times* or the University of So-and-so's English department—standards that might make your work acceptable to certain audiences but would divert you from the real and viable audiences to whom you can most meaningfully speak.

And, finally, four: If you, young writer, study rhetoric first, before specializing in creative writing, you will gain expertise in the basic skills of discourse upon which all subsequent discourse must rest. In your study of rhetoric you will come to realize that the difference between expository non-fiction and imaginative writing is a difference in degree and that the skills of invention, arrangement, and style are applicable to all discourse, regardless of the discourse's origin in fact or fancy and regardless of its intentions to entertain or inform. Though the particular problems of fiction

may differ from those of legal defenses, there are some amazing generalities about language that unite all communication efforts.

You will, of course, learn a great deal about language communication in other disciplines—linguistics, semantics, history of the language—yet it is rhetoric that puts all those disciplines into motion, and it is rhetoric that carries those disciplines into the front-line production of discourse—speeches, letters, philosophical tracts; poems, stories, plays.

This is not to say that in rhetoric you will learn all there is to know about the technique of creative writing. The craftsmanship of writing is a life-long concern—a constant adaption of general principles to particular circumstances. But the adaption must be of "something"—and that "something" is a knowledge of rhetoric, a technical expertise that, at its best, is broad and flexible, providing a repertoire of skills and a system of options. Enthymemes work in poems as well as in prose; metaphors are a part of scientific exposition as well as a part of fiction; beginnings and endings and the problems thereto are not exclusive to any kind of discourse; illustrations, examples, comparisons, and contrasts are standard fare in the most technical of articles and the most delicate of haiku; the sequential orders—climactic, chronological—are found in political harangues as well as in the recitations of imaginary love affairs.

If you will study rhetoric first, you will be saved the agony of plunging—as some students of creative writing do—into the details of the creative forms without a sound knowledge of fundamentals. You will be saved the building of your work upon the shifting sand of unintended fallacies, non sequiturs, incoherence, lack of unity, confused order, erratic stylistics. And you will be spared the embarrassment of attempting to juggle a flashing display of original images while sliding on the slippery floor of poor sentence structure, inadequate development of ideas, sloppy transitions from thought to thought.

And there is an ancillary expertise to be gained from rhetoric that should be mentioned: the increased capacity for perceiving human discourse. You, as a creative writer, will make much of your insight into human behavior, your close and analytical observation of human beings; thus you will be glad to find—as your understanding of rhetorical techniques increases—that your understanding also increases of how people communicate or fail to communicate,

relate or fail to relate. In the imitation of discourse, in your bringing characters together in dialogues and conversations, your knowledge of rhetoric will improve your comprehensions and articulation of the motives, intentions, procedures, even the convolutions of what human beings say to each other.

So I would talk to the young creative writer about attitude, perspective, evaluation, and expertise. But let's send him out of the room now and talk just a moment with each other, professionally, about the status of rhetoric in creative writing teaching today.

We can distinguish, it seems, between the study of traditional rhetoric as a prelude to the study of creative writing, and the incorporation of certain aspects of rhetoric into the teaching of creative writing itself. The incorporation, I have to admit, involves a certain transformation of traditional rhetoric if it is to be truly serviceable. For instance, rhetoric's ultimate goal of moving an audience to some action probably gives way in creative writing to moving an audience into a community of feeling and perception with the author. And whereas in traditional rhetoric one seeks to convince an audience of the reasonableness of the communication, in creative writing the goal may rather be to effect verisimilitude or an emotional intensity. Whereas in traditional rhetoric, communication—in a rather strict sense—is a sine qua non, in creative writing communication may sometimes bend to sheer experientialism: giving the reader a sense of denotationless beauty via patterns, sounds, rhythms, progressions, and the like.

Making such transformations, we can conceivably achieve a rhetoric of creative writing analogous to and developing from traditional rhetoric. We don't quite have that separate rhetoric of creative writing yet, but I believe something like it is emerging in the academic world, at least in a few of our writing programs.

If we were to go into the creative writing classroom today we would find, I think, three basic modes of instruction—and there would be no great difficulty in recognizing the class in which rhetoric is viable. In one classroom we'd find instruction going on according to the "method" school of acting—the student is stimulated, but is left to his own technical devices, encouraged only to express himself from his own depths. His creative products are to be judged by the criteria of his own involvement in their creation; by his sincerity and honesty. His work is to be considered successful to the extent that he has poured into the work his own passions and pains. In a second classroom, we'd find instruction focused primarily upon the construction of literary works; the student is taught

to write the poem or story as absolute forms—that is, in a Platonic way—with the products judged in the light of ideal examples of the genres. This kind of teaching is most consonant with the old "New Criticism" and is essentially concerned with literary works divorced altogether from both conception and reception. In the third classroom, we'd find the instruction centered upon helping the writer reach his audience: teaching the student a repertoire of skills, but evaluating those skills in relationship to readers; teaching the student to write a sonnet—but asking him to write it several times, in consideration of one audience this time, another audience another. The creative writing classroom—in which rhetoric is a major consideration—is primarily a workshop in which a student can present his work and be given feedback by representatives of various life-styles in our society today, a workshop in which the student will be forced to realize that he can't reach everyone and that what he "intends" is not what his auditors always "get"; he will be forced into an identification of the people he wants most to reach and the rhetoric it will take to reach them.

I think the rhetorically-oriented creative-writing classroom is developing. And, at the same time, there is a very special pedagogical need that—to my knowledge at least—has not yet been satisfied. And that is the need for a rhetorically-oriented creative-writing textbook. We must either incorporate more creative writing matters into our general rhetorics, or we must prepare special rhetorics dealing with the special goals of creative writing students. I don't, of course, mean that we don't have good books in the general area of rhetoric and creativity, but even such a fine book as Wayne Booth's *Rhetoric of Fiction* is not really the sort of book in which a student can find anything like specific writing advice. We need a text that sets forth actual writing practices drawn from a wide range of contemporary literature. We need a text that will show us all the different ways to bring a character through a door and into a room and that will advise us which way would be best—given our audience, our subject, and so on. We do have some excellent preliminary studies of literature that I think can make such a text increasingly possible: Herman Meyer's *The Poetics of Quotation in the European Novel*, for instance, or Barbara Herrnstine Smith's *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End*. But I call such works preliminary because the information they contain has not yet been incorporated into a practical rhetoric, into a systematic and sharable knowledge that can be used by the artist to create his own rhetorically-successful writing.

Rhetoric as a prelude to creative writing; rhetoric as an attitude and methodology in the teaching of creative writing. Both of these could change the complexion of literary artistry here at the end of the twentieth century. And I speak with great sincerity when I say that the call for a restitution of rhetoric is more than the self-serving admonition of the rhetorician himself. I have, in my teaching career at least, seen too many "creative writing tragedies"--the tragedies of talented people denied their creative fulfillment because they never experienced the baptism of rhetoric. I've seen young students, older men and women wanting to express themselves, visiting poets reading their work--failing because of an inability or unwillingness to consider the nature of their audience and to make any accommodations to it. How tragic to see the talented creative person uttering his words blindly into the void with no one listening. Or, almost as tragic, hearing him misdirect his words--speaking to one audience, but speaking the language of another. I think such is a sad waste, and if I were the god of literature for a day, I think I'd take my lightning bolts--or rose petals--or whatever--and shatter through the romantic myths of creativity that hang over our heads. I would illuminate the creative experience with the rigors and liberations of rhetorical knowledge.

Winston Weathers
University of Tulsa

Rhetoric and Linguistics

In the definition of a famous Roman, the orator is a good man, speaking well. Study of Quintilian's *Institutes*, however, reveals that the definition must be expanded: a good orator is a good man, speaking well, who knows everything. Thus linguistics—the systematic, scientifically-oriented study of the nature and structure of language—is a part of the rhetorician's equipment. The good rhetor, the good orator, knows all about language. Conversely, the good linguist would know all about rhetoric. And classically, no division between the two does exist.

Fortunately for the length of this paper, we can limit the comparison; some parts of the ancient, inclusive world of rhetoric and some parts of the constantly-growing, endlessly-varied field of linguistics can be left out of consideration. In another famous definition, rhetoric is the art of persuasion (or, in Kenneth Burke's more useful modern term, identification). An art is consciously acquired, and persuasion or identification must have an audience. So, many things which are a part of modern linguistics—descriptive phonology, comparative morphology, morpho-graphemic rules—will be omitted. Some areas of syntax we can leave out. Syntactic patterning, in ordinary speech, must be unconscious and swift; the speaker may hesitate for a word choice, but he cannot hesitate for a transformation he does not know he is making. The sentences of unprepared speech concern the linguist but not the rhetorician; the rhetor does not find sentences—or even write them; he re-writes them; they are in no way unconscious.

The term *rhetor* is used here to mean a combination speaker/writer and the term *rhetorician* to mean one who studies efficient speech and writing. I omit two areas of discourse which would engage both of them usually but which lie outside of immediate linguistic concerns—invention and arrangement. My rhetor has

something to say and can arrange it; he is not in need of a heuristic but an artistic procedure for choosing his words and forming his sentences.

Given his something to say and his desire to affect his audience, modern linguistics does offer the speaker/writer several grammatical theses about how he might best form his sentences. Three may briefly engage our attention—stratificational grammar, tagmemic grammar, and transformational/generative grammar. Stratificational grammar may be the wave of the future, with its concentration on meaning—lexemes, lexons, and the like—and its psychological correlations of the strata of language. It is very useful as descriptive theory, perhaps as heuristic theory, and in terms of comparisons among languages.

Of course, any modern theory of language is, by definition, descriptive, comparative, and universal. All theories conform to the basic data of language as now understood, and the differences lie not even in interpretations of those data but in approaches to the use of them. I do not think, however, that stratificational grammar is as helpful in the construction of the rhetor's periods as is tagmemic or transformational/generative. Certainly it has not been as much used.

Transformational grammar, which begins with *Syntactic Structures* in 1957, is helpful to the rhetor because of its concentration on formal properties of syntax and sound and because of its search for the underlying universals of language generation. As it is widely studied, and widely taught, it is accessible to the rhetor and can help him examine his sentence combinations.

In spite of its abstractness, or perhaps because of it, T/G grammar has been most lucid to many students when it begins from the already formed, or transformed, surface structures. As a theory of language, it began by moving away from the description of the surface attempted (with considerable success) by the structural linguist. However, the ordinary rhetor can grasp its principles only by considering a surface structure and discerning processes and principles beneath. Although it is enlightening for him to recognize phrase structure rules, and the transformations which act on the phrases, he need not descend to anything quite so abstract as a deep structure. For his conscious applications of principles begin at some middling point on the transformational scale, when he deliberately begins to manipulate his verbals and his verbids and even his verbs into a sentence that communicates.

There is a divergence of aims here. The rhetor does not have to know what he is doing, not really; he has only to be able to do it. The rhetorician who instructs himself or others has only to recognize what is effective and determine how to accomplish it. He is interested in competence only insofar as it manifests itself in performance. The linguist has to understand the dynamics of language, has to understand both competence and performance, but does not particularly have to tell others how to perform.

Although many able thinker/writers bridge the gap between rhetor-rhetorician-linguist, one might be mentioned here as belonging, however loosely, with the transformationalists. Francis Christensen, whose *Notes Toward a New Rhetoric* is one of the best books around for the rhetor, declares himself a rhetorician. His use of the term *generative* is not grammatical but conceptual. His four-part scheme for assembling sentences—addition, direction of modification, levels of abstraction, and textural variety—attends not only to transformations but to readjusting the surface structure by rhetorical devices. He writes forthrightly about how to place absolutes and the use of adverbial sentence openers.

He is similar to early rhetoricians in another way, because he goes beyond the sentence to the whole paragraph, beyond the colon to the period, as it were. This is not arrangement so much as the stylish development of a thought in a "meta-sentence." The ancients, too, thought in terms of rhythmical and logical wholes.

For our purposes, the importance of Christensen and some similar writers is that they regard sentences as structures to be re-written, according to the rhetorical techne of a writer who pays conscious attention to what he is doing and revises what he has done.

A third kind of grammatical theory, the tagmemic, is of special service to the rhetor. Kenneth Pike is one important practitioner here, although many others contribute to the field. Tagmemic grammar describes language, and all human behavior, in terms of particles, waves, and fields, of slots and functions. In many ways it depends on syntax patterning as understood by all grammarians, but the concept of function is more inclusive than in other linguistic theories. The patterns of language are divided into sound (the basic unit being, as usual, the phoneme), meaningful units (the basic unit being, as usual, the morpheme), and patterns of function (the basic unit being the tagmeme). The function concept interweaves language with other areas of human behavior; a tagmeme may be either a verbal or a non-verbal construct so long as it functions in

the proper slot. This equation fits neatly with a division of classical rhetoric frequently ignored—delivery—and with the recognition of the modern sociolinguist of the importance of body language in decoding linguistic utterance. It is clear to any grammarian that a pitch pattern can function as an interrogative constituent as well as can an auxiliary permutation, that heavy stress can function imperatively as well as can deletion of the subject NP. To think of these as tagmemes or slot-fillers makes it easy to add rhetorical apparatus, the raised eyebrow, the direct eye, the aggressive hand motions, which all actors know and which a rhetorician employs as a matter of conscious or unconscious technique. The sociolinguist recognizes that these encoded signals will be decoded improperly by an audience which hears or reads only words. Pike himself has written extensively in sociolinguistics.

What I have said about these three theories of language is, I realize, sadly, absurdly, sketchy. In attempting to talk about rhetoric and linguistics here, I have, I fear, got myself into the position of someone who tries to talk to an audience of sailors about the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. The two have much in common, but they are very different; there is a great deal to say about both of them. It's likely enough that most sailors know more about both oceans than I do. I suspect that what I am really doing is scattering around a few drops from each.

To return, any modern theory of language will be more nearly akin to the notions of classical rhetoric than earlier approaches have been because it will be universal and philosophical. The whole drift of linguistic study in the second half of the twentieth century has been that way; I have already mentioned the contributions of Noam Chomsky to the ideas of language and mind. His is only an obvious name in a field of linguistic research so rich that I hardly know how to start naming names—Charles J. Fillmore on the universality of case, Fodor and Katz or Stephen Ullman in semantics, Sidney Greenberg or George Zipf in phonemic and semantic usages, Roman Jakobson on anything.

Two new, or newly named, fields of linguistics directly engage the rhetor—sociolinguistics, which I have already mentioned, and the not entirely distinct psycholinguistics. Underlying the progress in these fields is the really remarkable work done by biolinguists who study the physiological basis of speech. E. H. Lenneberg offers convincing evidence that brain dominance, the structure of the human oro-pharyngeal cavity, and the coordination of motor and

speech development prove that all humans, and only all humans, share language, and that the universality of the human speech-producing anatomy supports the universality of a semantic, grammatical, and phonological matrix of language in the brain.

This leads to certain exciting areas of psychological linguistics —human memory, verbal learning, the processing of verbal data. This research, much of which grows out of Chomskyan theorizing about the nature of language, reminds us of another often-neglected field of classical rhetoric—memory. The ancient rhetorician sought devices to aid and improve his own memory so that he could deliver long and powerful orations. In that sense, memory was not involved with audience. However, the rhetor thought much about what he could make his audience remember and act upon, and what ornaments would contribute to that end.

Current research in psycholinguistics and biolinguistics looks into how verbal stimuli act on the cognitive process; in other words, what patterns of sound or structure are most noticeable, most memorable? When the mind stores memories, what does it actually store — phonemes, morphemes, tagmemes, lexemes? How are these units processed, both in storage and when summoned out of it? If the psychologist can learn about the physical working of memory, he can perhaps crack into the code of natural language. Although much psycholinguistic work is outside our area here, studies of the use of syntactic patterns touch on both classical and modern rhetoric. A recent article in the *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* probes into the comprehensibility of subject-verb relations in complex sentences. The Greeks thought about that, too: they knew the subject-verb relationship touches memory intimately, but they analyzed it into zeugma, hypozeuxis, parison, or hypotaxis.

Here a bothersome question arises. Language really is an ocean. It is so impossible to cover it all that we keep trying to set up limits —trying to draw off latitude and longitude so that we can navigate. But the ocean will not observe our boundaries. We must analyze and classify or drown, but the lines we draw on the water are our own, and they do not always match up with the lines drawn by other navigators. Much that Aristotle classified as "appropriate style," in Book III of the *Rhetoric*, is grammar now—concord between subjects and verbs in number, or between nouns and adjectives in gender. We call it *morphology*, but he called it *lexis*. What psycholinguistic experiments seem to be telling us now is that the units we have tried to classify will not stay separate. Patterns of

sound and syntax and meaning are all one for our hearing, our cognition, our encoding or decoding of linguistic information. The phonemes and the morphemes and the lexemes run in together.

When writers in *Language and Speech* report their investigation of "Sentence Processing as a Function of Syntax, Short Term Memory Capacity, the Meaningfulness of the Stimulus and Age," their work is related to linguistics and biology and classical rhetoric. When scientists run tests to discover at what age a young child begins to respond to (to be affected by, to remember) the symmetry of clauses (the Greeks had a word for that, too – parallelism), we see that the ancients knew something that we had forgotten for a while about the organization of the human mind.

From a different approach, the "psychosemantic," Wallace Chafe's "Language and Memory" connects the kinds of memory—surface, shallow, and deep—with syntactic and intonation patterns, such as the placement and stress of temporal adverbs. His correlation of the depth of expectation involved in the uses of the future with the levels of memory involved in the choice of the past tense is an unusually thought-provoking concept.

With such varying disciplines, we must consider the question of method. It does not arise when we read the classical rhetoricians —they simply tell us what they know, not how they found it out. The psychologist has proceeded by experimentation (usually experimentation on the reactions of others). The sociologist works fruitfully with surveying, interviewing procedures. Grammarians and lexicographers have always turned to literature for guidance, usually for support of precepts they had already determined. C. C. Fries, in the 1940's and 50's, reversed this process by examining as large a corpus of material as possible, one much closer to the native speech than to the literary, before drawing any conclusion. More recently, introspection, in which the linguist examines language by thinking of what he himself intuits about it: "Can I say this?" "Is this grammatical in my dialect?" has provided new starting points. Elicitation is the same thing, but directed toward others: "Can you say this?" "What would you put in this slot?"

These methods, which I have described very superficially, are imperfect, subject to abuse and liable to failure. Introspection is necessarily subjective and often inaccurate. Elicitation depends for its success on finding cooperative, unself-conscious subjects who not only will, but *can* respond accurately.

Yet some very distinguished work has been accomplished by these methods. Did not the Brothers Grimm elicit fairy tales? *The Linguistic Atlas of the United States* has got on very nicely by finding the right people and asking them what they say. A recent book, *Elicitation Experiments in English*, describes research in which elicitation has been refined to modern pitch, taking in both judgment and performance, and allowing for every variable in experimental pressure and subject response, with the results electronically analyzed.

All twentieth-century study, of course, depends heavily on statistical method and the computer. Wilhelm and Jakob Grimm had memory banks equal to those of IBM, but most of us do not, and the computer has revolutionized linguistic study as much as any other. Far more data can be collected, and much more complex examinations can be made, than ever before. The social scientists, particularly, to whose disciplines language is central, have combined their research with data processing to supply the rhetor with material of peculiar interest to him.

For like the rhetorician and unlike the pure linguist, the social scientist makes value judgments. A descriptive dialectologist may measure a dialect only in terms of its -emes, but a sociolinguist measures the psychological and cultural impact of speaking one dialect or another, as a rhetorician considers the effectiveness of one dialect over another for a given audience.

Two problems in this area trouble the linguist. One is that the rigor of experimental science narrows the range of the research. One of the most famous monographs of psycho-socio-linguistics was published by Osgood and Walker in the *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology in* 1959; it is an analysis of the syntax and vocabulary of suicide notes. They began with one hundred suicide notes and one hundred ordinary personal letters as controls, but conditions of the experiment reduced the number to sixty-nine suicide notes and seventy-two ordinary letters. The general linguist is impressed with the problem of getting hold of even one hundred genuine suicide notes—and appalled by the paucity of sixty-nine notes as a sample of human language.

Another problem which faces the ordinary rhetor (or any ordinary person) is that modern science has no certainties—only variables and frequencies and percentages. Quintilian calmly directed his students to "do it this way," without sharing any percentages with them. But *Language* or *Speech Monographs* or *Language and*

Speech are full of mands and means and vectors and Cayley diagrams. Many a reader has floundered through an article on a subject of great interest to him only to reach a conclusion something like this: "Thus the statistical variable of .05 can be seen to be quite significant under certain conditions."

For all this, the social scientist in the second half of the twentieth century has the machinery to test out some of the ancient insights of rhetoric. A case in point is an experiment conducted by Bowers and Osborn on the power of metaphor. Beginning from the dicta of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, that metaphor not only alters the convictions of an audience but makes it admire the intelligence and trustworthiness of the rhetor (contributes to his ethos), the psychologists taped two versions of two speeches. Each pair was identical except that one concluded with a literal and the other with a metaphorical ending. Reaction of subjects to these two speeches was carefully assessed. To some extent, it was as the ancients had written—the metaphorical conclusions did change attitudes somewhat more than the literal. But the ethos of the speaker varied with the metaphor. One speech ended with a death image; the other ended with an extended sex/life image. The death image, although effective in changing emotional attitudes toward the topic, affected the ethos of the speaker adversely—the audience did not much like or trust him. The sex/life metaphor met with a noticeable difference; it changed the audience's emotional reactions to the topic, but it also made the audience somewhat more disposed to respect the intelligence, trustworthiness, and ingenuity of the speaker. The insights of the ancient rhetoricians are validated, but the psychology of the twentieth century has played its part.

One last connection between rhetoric and linguistics, perhaps the most important of all. So far I have assumed that the rhetor has a message to convey and an audience to whom he wishes to convey it, and have taken no interest in the message. The linguist, I have assumed, has not been much concerned with either message or audience but simply with the language itself. He has demanded objectivity of himself. But there are indications that the last two decades of research, and now the future, may not allow this stance any longer.

In his presidential address to the Linguistic Society of America in December of 1972, Dwight Bolinger said firmly that "Truth is a linguistic question." We can, he said, no longer discuss syntax and semantics without realizing that they can be used to mislead and

that the hearer is not automatically equipped to recognize this. In other words, messages can be, and often are, encoded in such a way that they cannot be accurately decoded. The country is now crying for truth in business and truth in government, and it is not enough for the linguist to insist that he describes the system of language and that he is not responsible for the uses that men make of that system. For we now realize, Bolinger said, that "the clamor for truth not only embraces the way language is used, but the way language is." Syntax—the unattributed passive which provides no subject to be held responsible, the nominal compound which obscures the relationship between two nouns by omitting the preposition—can conceal and distort meaning. If communication is possible only in language, then "truth is a linguistic question because communication is impossible without it."

We are back in Athens, back almost 2500 years, back to that pesky old man who so persistently asked, "But is it good?" "Is it just?" "Is it true?" that society finally had to destroy him to get on with its business and its government. We are back to the ancient conflict between the technician who searched for effectiveness and the philosopher who searched for truth. Rhetoric has never been able to evade this issue. Now it looks as if linguistics must face it, too.

Turner Kobler
Texas Woman's University

Notes

Bolinger, Dwight. "Truth Is a Linguistic Question," *Language*, 49 (1973), 539-50.

Bowers, John Waite and Michael M. Osborn. "Attitudinal Effects of Selected Types of Concluding Metaphors in Persuasive Speeches," *Speech Monographs*, 33 (1966), 147-55.

Chafe, Wallace L. "Language and Memory," *Language*, 49 (1973), 261-81.

Christensen, Francis. *Notes Toward a New Rhetoric: Six Essays for Teachers*, 1967.

Gamlin, Peter J. "Sentence Processing as a Function of Syntax, Short Term Memory Capacity, the Meaningfulness of the Stimlus and Age," *Language and Speech*, 14 (1971), 115-34.

Greenbaum, Sidney and Randolph Quirk. *Elicitation Experiments in English*, 1970.

Hamilton, Helen and James Deese. "Comprehensibility and Subject-Verb Relations in Complex Sentences," *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 10 (1970), 165-70.

Lamb, Sidney. *Outline of Stratificational Grammar*, 1966.

Lenneberg, E. H. *Biological Foundations of Language*, 1967.

Osgood, Charles E. and Evelyn G. Walker. "Motivation and Language Behavior: A Content Analysis of Suicide Notes," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 59 (1959), 58-67.

Pike, Kenneth L. *Language in Relation to a Unified Structure of Human Behavior*, 1967.

Rhetoric, Whether Goest Thou?

When I chose the title "Rhetoric, Whether Goest Thou?"—an obvious variation on the *quo vadis* motif – what I had in mind was posing the question, not about the *whither*, the direction, that rhetoric will take in the coming years but about the *whether*, the capability of rhetoric to adjust to the growing volume and variety of rhetorical activities in our time. Whether rhetoric can adapt will, of course, have some influence on whither it goes in the future. But *whether* poses a more crucial question, it seems to me, than *whither* or *whence* or *wherefore*. With apologies to one of our panelists, let me say that if rhetoric cannot Weather the storm, it will Winstonly wither on the vine. I presume that the toilers in the vineyard would prefer to harvest the fruit of the vine and bring it to an intoxicating ferment. If it is true that the Kobler is worthy of her hire, all of us should Bennett-fit if rhetoricians Tate their burden.[1]

Now that I have purged my system of those dyspeptic puns, I can settle down to less serious business.

Unless my observations have been egregiously myopic, the current scene exhibits a greater abundance and variety of what can be regarded as rhetorical activities than I ever witnessed before in my lifetime. Watergate alone has presented a three-ringed, three-tiered circus of rhetorical activities. But there are many other arenas under the Big Top of contemporary life, and in each of those arenas prodigious acts are being performed, which contribute in their own way to the divertissement or the heart-stopping of the spectators. The ringmasters are scurrying about, frantically trying to keep the acts in bounds, and the peanut galleries are howling for more bread or more circuses.

At this point, I should define what I mean by "rhetorical activity." From the stock of available definitions of rhetoric, I choose one from *The Prospect of Rhetoric* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:

Prentice-Hall, 1971), a report of the National Developmental Project on Rhetoric, which held its first conference at the Johnson Wingspread Center in Racine, Wisconsin, in January of 1970. Using the definition of rhetoric provided in that book, I regard as a *rhetorical activity* any activity in which "man uses or is used by symbols of inducement" (p. 210). By accepting the term *symbols* rather than the term *words*, I have broadened the purview to include not only verbal utterance or discourse, the traditional province of rhetoric, but also such non-verbal media as icons – to use Marshall McLuhan's term for a variety of pictorial images – and sounds, whether musical or cacophonous. I realize that by expanding the province of rhetoric to embrace the non-verbal as well as verbal, I run two risks: (1) making rhetoric so all-inclusive that it loses its distinctness as a discipline and (2) alienating those teachers who, by disposition or training, feel uncomfortable in any medium other than the *logos*.

Temperamentally, I too feel more comfortable in the verbal medium. I feel that I am in my element when I am poring over a printed page; on the other hand, I often feel a bit spooked when I listen to music that is totally divorced from words or when I watch the pictorial images on a television screen after the sound has been turned down to an inaudible level. Icons and sounds are languages too, but I am still at the stage where I frequently have to resort to a dictionary in order to read those languages. For my students, however, icons and sounds are native languages, languages they learned, not at their mothers' knees but from those endless hours they have spent at the side of their stereo sets and their TV boxes. They need another kind of dictionary to read the printed pages that I delight in, and I am beginning to suspect that when left to their own volition, they are going less and less to the printed page and to Webster's word-hoard. If they have a library, it is more likely to be a library of record albums. Nor is it students alone who are neglecting the printed page. I urge you to read George Steiner's ominous essay "The Retreat from the Word" in his collection entitled *Language and Silence*. In that essay, he paints a gloomy picture of how academically-respectable disciplines such as chemistry, physics, biology, history, and economics are recording and transmitting their knowledge, not in articulated sentences but in the mathematical modes of the chart, the graph, the curve, and the statistical table. What has happened, Steiner says, is that "the sum of realities of which words can give a necessary and sufficient account has sharply diminished" (p. 25). Steiner is as unhappy about

this noticeable retreat from the word as I or anybody else who cherishes the word must be. But because I too have observed the retreat from the word and have recognized the pre-emptive incursion of other media of communication, I am prepared to run the risks of blurring the confines of rhetoric and of alienating my reluctant colleagues. I want to become more polyglot than I am. I want to learn all the dialects of the twentieth century so that in the years that remain to me in this vale of tears, I won't have to sit in the corner like a dumb thing, mumbling my familiar quotations and fingering my first editions. We teachers can still reserve our primary allegiance for the spoken and written word, but we can enhance our literacy and certainly can enhance our efficacy as rhetoricians if we are willing to study how words interact with, and serve as an adjunct to, other media of communication.

After all that indulgence in plaintive apologia, let me return to the definition that I adopted from *The Prospect of Rhetoric*: rhetoric is the study of how man uses and is used by symbols of inducement. Somehow that definition makes me optimistic about the future of rhetoric. And it makes me less doubtful about whether rhetoric will go. In the great Monopoly game among the other disciplines, rhetoric can confidently laugh off the injunction, "Go directly to jail. Do not pass Go. Do not collect two hundred dollars." Rhetoric can afford to be temporarily arrested. Rhetoric can collect its thoughts, assess it resources, and calculate its risks before it has to make its next perilous career toward the grand pay-off at Go. And judging from some of the impressive prose and poetry that have been issuing from behind iron bars recently, the jailhouse is not a bad place for a rhetorician to spend a few days in.

From my listening post as an editor of a journal, as a reviewer for several publishers of prospectuses and manuscripts of new rhetoric texts, as an attendant at several conferences, seminars, and symposia on rhetoric, I have gathered ample evidence that many contemporary rhetoricians are collecting their thoughts, assessing their resources, calculating their risks – and going for broke or the $200 pay-off. I would like to lay some of that evidence on the board so that you can decide whether rhetoric is a piece of property in which you would care to make an investment.

One area of rhetoric that I find to be in a very healthy state is the area of style. Ever since the appearance of rhetoric texts by such Greeks as Aristotle, Isocrates, Gorgias, Hermogenes, and Longinus, the study of style has been a major preoccupation of rhetoricians.

In fact, the study of style became such a preoccupation with some of them that they neglected the study of the other canons of rhetoric – invention, arrangement, memory, and delivery – with the consequence that rhetoric was substantially impoverished and was saddled with the adhesive reputation of being mere "sound and fury, signifying nothing." But it seems to me that in our time, professional linguists and electronic computers have enlivened and enriched the study of style.[2]

Noam Chomsky's theory, for instance, about deep structure and surface structure has served to prevent contemporary students of style from divorcing meaning from expression, and vice versa. J. L. Austin's theories about utterances as "speech acts" may help to discourage the notion of a dichotomy between thought and expression. In one of the issues of *College Composition and Communication* this fall, I will be publishing an article by Alan Lemke, in which he argues that we teachers of composition should move away from the expression theory of writing and adopt the action theory of writing as the rationale of our composition courses. The expression theory, Lemke says, "sees writing as a process through which a writer more or less adeptly puts thoughts into words." The action theory, on the other hand, is "one which holds that a writer thinks and then translates thought into overt verbal acts." Teachers committed to the expression theory are likely to write on a student's paper, "Your ideas are good, but your expression is poor." Lemke maintains, however, that when a person thinks one thing and then writes something slightly different, "he has not expressed himself poorly; he has simply completed two speech acts with different meanings" – the meaning of the thought and the meaning of the overt verbal act. The "speech act" theory should be of interest to rhetoricians, for if to write or to speak is to *do* something rather than to *express* something, we may be influenced to regard utterances as completions of actions in the real world of events – acts such as warning, complimenting, reprimanding, urging, promising, pledging, thanking, affirming, informing, correcting. And when we look at what Austin calls the perlocutionary aspects of utterances, we are into the rhetorician's heartland, because we are studying the effects of utterances on the thoughts, feelings, or actions of the audience.[3] I think it significant that one of our more prominent new rhetoricians, Richard Ohmann, has written extensively, not only about the usefulness of transformational grammar in the analysis of style but also about the rhetorical dimensions of J. L. Austin's "speech act" theory.[4]

The computer too has made a helpful contribution to the study of style. Not only has the computer facilitated the collection of data for complete and accurate concordances and word-lists, but it has also facilitated descriptive studies of lexical and syntactical patterns in prose and poetic texts. The computer-assisted gathering of hard evidence about the stylistic features that actually appear in printed pages has helped to confirm or to correct the impressionistic and subjective characterizations of style that we have had in the past. Does Ernest Hemingway write predominantly in short, simple sentences? — an impression we may get from simply reading him. The computer can answer that question — and others like it. (I can assure you that the computer will turn up many surprises about Hemingway's style.) As an example of what an industrious, intelligent, sensitive student of language and literature can do with the aid of the computer, let me recommend to you Louis Milic's *A Quantitative Approach to the Style of Jonathan Swift* (The Hague: Mouton, 1967). We will get more studies of this kind as our graduate students, desperate to find unworked topics for their dissertations, turn to this relatively unplowed field.

As further evidence of the healthy state of stylistic studies today, I would point to the many collections of essays on style now available for classroom use and to the existence of Richard Bennett's journal *Style*, now in its seventh year of publication. I would point to the many impressive articles in that journal that explore theories of style or apply theories to the analysis of specific texts, and I would also point to the astonishingly extensive annual bibliography of stylistic studies in that journal. Because the study of style concentrates on *verbal* discourse, it should be congenial to teachers of English, whether their primary interest is literature or linguistics or rhetoric or composition. Intensive study of style may be unfamiliar territory for many of them, but at least it is not alien territory.

Another healthy area of rhetorical studies at present, one that assures me that rhetoric will indeed go with the march of events, is that of invention — what has lately been referred to as pre-writing, all those processes that we engage in before we sit down to inscribe words on a blank sheet of paper. Invention is unquestionably the most crucial area in the whole composition process, but unfortunately it is — or has been — the most mysterious area. Invention gets us into this misty mid-region of epistemology, the branch of philosophy that deals with cognition, with the question of how the human mind comes to know. That rhetoricians since the time of Aristotle have been vitally interested in the problem of invention

is evident from the preponderant attention they accorded it in their rhetoric texts. Those who did not find the system of the topics devised by the classical rhetoricians to be of much help in cracking the mystery of invention turned hopefully to the disquisitions of creative writers. Surely the poets, novelists, dramatists would be able to give us an illuminating exposition of the composing process, from conception to final execution. Coleridge tried his hand at such an exposition in the *Biographia Literaria*, but unfortunately, he never got down out of the abstract level of talking about the imagination and the fancy. Perhaps the most illuminating exposition that we have had from a creative writer is to be found in Henry James's *Notebooks* and in the Prefaces for the New York edition of his novels and stories. But even that "most" was not enough. James was able to tell us what the "germ" was for many of his stories and then show us what that "germ" matured into after it had been drawn up out of the "deep well of the unconscious." But even a self-conscious artist like James was not able to explain fully just how the idea evolved from germ to maturation.

Nor have I found that any of the new rhetoricians has given us the ultimate key to unlocking the mystery of how we discover something to say on any given subject. But by appropriating some of the findings and insights of physical scientists, psychologists, psycholinguists, and cultural anthropologists like Claude Levi-Strauss, some of the contemporary rhetoricians have provided us with some new heuristic procedures that can aid the stymied writer in finding something to say. Richard L. Larson, who has himself published some valuable articles on invention, has conveniently summarized several of the recent heuristic systems in an article published in the December 1973 issue of *Kansas English* ("Invention: Discovering One's World," pp. 18-24).

One of the most innovative of the recent systems of invention is the one that Richard Young, Alton Becker, and Kenneth Pike developed from tagmemics and presented in their rhetoric text *Rhetoric: Discovery and Change* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1970). Combining the perspectives of particle, wave, and field – notions that they appropriated from physics – with the perspectives of contrast, variation, and distribution – notions that they appropriated from linguistics – Young, Becker, and Pike have devised a heuristic procedure that, as actual classroom experiments have shown, students find useful in generating ideas for papers they have to write. Running the themes of variation, contrast, and distribution successively through particle, wave, and field, the

student is provided with a set of nine questions that he can apply as a heuristic probe of virtually any subject. So, for instance, he can look at the contrastive features of an object, idea, or experience (how does it differ from other objects, ideas, or experiences that are like it?), at its range of variation (how much can the object, idea, or experience be changed and still be recognizable as what it is?), and at its distribution (how are the components organized in relation to one another? More specifically, how are they related by class, in class systems, in temporal sequence, and in space?). Once the student gets a firm grasp of the differentiation among the nine questions, he finds the questions as useful for generating something to say about a subject as journalists find the formulaic questions *who? what? when? where? how?* when they are writing a news story.

Similarly, William Irmscher in his *The Holt Guide to English* took Kenneth Burke's dramatistic pentad of *action, agent, scene, means,* and *purpose* and subdivided those five topics into fifteen basic questions that are capable of generating kernel propositions, which in turn can be expanded, supported, and evaluated.[5] Richard Larson devised a much longer list of questions that can be asked when one is writing about single items, about a completed event or an ongoing process, about abstract concepts, about collections of items or events, or about propositions.[6] From my own experience in the composition classroom, I find that sets of formulaic questions serve the students better in generating ideas than do the inert classical topics that I have presented in my text.

Lately, Richard Larson and Richard Young have been exploring the possibility of using the technique of problem-solving as a heuristic device. Larson has written about the problem-solving process in his article "Problem-Solving, Composing, and General Education" (*College English*, 34 (March, 1972), 628-35), and I won't summarize that article here. Under a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, Richard Young has been experimenting with the problem-solving technique in a rhetoric class for seniors in the College of Engineering at the University of Michigan. Young reported on this experiment in a paper "Problems and the Rhetorical Process" that he prepared for a forum on rhetoric that I chaired at the Midwest Modern Language Association convention in Chicago in November of 1973 and in a published summary report entitled *The Tagmemic Discovery Procedure: An Evaluation of Its Uses in the Teaching of Rhetoric* (University of Michigan, 1973). The problem-solving approach can help the student generate ideas

for a piece of writing, Young contends, if he can be trained to recognize and analyze a problem and then to articulate clearly what the problem is and what the "unknown" is – that is, what it is that will eliminate or mitigate the problem or the "felt difficulty." Another dividend of the problem-solving technique is that if the student is dealing with something that is really a problem for him – and Young insists that his students deal with real, not invented or putative, problems – the genuine quest for a solution can lead to the kind of purposeful writing that many of our assigned topics often cannot produce.

In an article in the May 1970 issue of *College English*,[7] Ross Winterowd proposed another set of inventional topics. He argued that the seven basic relationships that exist among sentences or, more accurately, among what Kellogg Hunt calls T-units can serve as topics to generate units of discourse larger than the sentence. Those seven basic relationships, which are the source of coherence in collocation of clauses, Winterowd classifies as (1) coordinate, (2) obversative, (3) causative, (4) conclusive, (5) alternative, (6) inclusive, and (7) sequential. Winterowd says,

> Any set of topics is merely a way of triggering the process. Thus the student, say, who has difficulty with the invention of arguments, can use the seven-item list to tell him what might come next – not what content, to be sure, but what relation his next unit must take to the previous one. There are only seven possibilities. (pp. 834-5)

I see immense possibilities for the friutful application of Winterowd's seven-item list in the composition process, because the seven relationships that he outlines seem to me to designate, as the classical topics do, the characteristic ways in which the human mind operates when it is operating deliberatively. Having seen the manuscript of the rhetoric text that Winterowd is doing for Harcourt, Brace, I can tell you that in that forthcoming text, he demonstrates the practical applications of his system of topics – as well as other systems of topics – to the composition process. Having seen the manuscript of a book to be called *A Theory of Conceptual Rhetoric* and the manuscripts of some forthcoming articles, I can also inform you that Frank D'Angelo of Arizona State University has formulated his own set of generating devices that could be helpful to students who have trouble finding something to say.

The upshot of this review of some of the recent work in inventional theory is that I find the current thinking about the most

crucial stage of the composition process to be in a vigorous and promising state and that if we teachers of composition do not entirely abandon the cognitive approach in the classroom, in response to the current vogue for the affective and the turn-on-the-spigot approaches, we will be able to make use of these new heuristic procedures to provide genuine help for our floundering students.

Another encouraging development is the attempt by contemporary rhetoricians to devise new ways of classifying modes or genres of discourse. The classical rhetoricians dealt primarily with persuasive discourse, and partly on the basis of the kind of audience that listened to the discourse and partly on the basis of whether the discourse dealt with the past, the present, or the future, they distinguished three species of persuasive discourse: judicial, deliberative, and ceremonial. Late in the nineteenth century Alexander Bain proposed the "four forms of discourse" that remained the staple of school texts for over seventy-five years: exposition, narration, description, and argumentation. But in the last ten years, some interesting new rationales for classifying kinds of discourse have been proposed.

In 1964 Leo Rockas, in his *Modes of Rhetoric* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964), classified the types according to the means of procedure: the static modes (description and definition); the temporal modes (narration and process); the mimetic modes (drama and dialogue); and the mental modes (reverie and persuasion). Winston Weathers and Otis Winchester, after having proposed in their 1968 text *Prevalent Forms of Prose* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin) the more conventional types of the popular article, the professional article, the personal essay, the formal essay, and the critical essay, in 1970, in their text *The Attitudes of Rhetoric* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall), came up with a much more interesting and fruitful way of classifying discourses according to the writer's attitude toward his subject and his audience. Arguing that attitude constitutes a significant part of the writer's message and influences the choice of strategies that carry the message to the audience, they presented nine different kinds of discourse according to attitude: confident, judicious, quiet, imperative, impassioned, compassionate, critical, angry, and absurd.

James Moffett and James Kinneavy have also done some astute rethinking about the modes of discourse. Viewing rhetorical interaction in pronominal terms of *I*, *you*, and *it*, Moffett in his *Teaching the Universe of Discourse* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968) proposed two ways of classifying discourse according to a time/space

perspective. In terms of the distance in time and space between speaker and listener, between first person and second person in the rhetorical interaction, Moffett classified four kinds of discourse:

Reflection—Intrapersonal communication between two parts of one nervous system (as in a journal or an interior monologue)

Conversation—Interpersonal communication between two people in vocal range

Correspondence—Interpersonal communication between remote individuals or small groups with some personal knowledge of each other

Publication—Impersonal communication to a large anonymous group extended over space and/or time (p. 33).

Moffett then proposes another classification according to the increasing distance between the speaker and his subject, between the *I* and the *it* of the rhetorical interaction:

What is happening—drama, recording

What happened—narrative, reporting

What happens—exposition, generalizing

What may happen—argumentation, theorizing (p. 35).

In his *A Theory of Discourse: The Aims of Discourse* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971), James L. Kinneavy viewed rhetorical interaction in terms appropriated from communications theory — encoder, decoder, signal, reality — and he distinguished the types of discourse according to which element in this four-part interrelationship received the predominant emphasis. If the emphasis is on the encoder (the speaker or writer), we get Expressive Discourse; if on the decoder (the audience), we get Persuasive Discourse; if on the signal (the message, the work, the artifact), we get Literary Discourse; if on the reality (the universe, "the world out there"), we get Reference Discourse. Reference Discourse in turn is subdivided into three distinct species: Informative, Scientific, and Exploratory. Each of these aims of discourse, Kinneavy claims and demonstrates, has it own system of logic, its own organizational structure, and its own stylistic characteristics.

All of these attempts to invent a new terminology and rationale for kinds of discourse may have been sparked by Northrop Frye's concern for reorienting and redefining genres in his influential *The*

Anatomy of Criticism (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1957). In any case, all this serious reworking of the theories about modes of discourse has inspirited me about the future of rhetorical studies, because it opens the way to our considering a broader spectrum of discourse than we have traditionally dealt with in our classrooms.

What else do I see on the current scene that makes me optimistic about the future of rhetorical studies? Many things, really, but I can only mention some of them here and hope you will pursue those developments or suggestions that interest you particularly.

For one thing, I was much impressed by the prize-winning essay by Richard Coe, which Gary Tate will publish in the next issue of *Freshman English News*. In this essay, Coe contends that we have to develop a new rhetoric to fit the changed consciousness of our computer age. The kind of mechanistic, linear consciousness that has prevailed until recent years is a heritage of Newtonian physics and Descartesian epistemology and is built on a set of analogies with energy systems – the billiard-ball model of the universe. Cybernetic consciousness, on the other hand, is built on a set of analogies with information systems and operates, Coe maintains, on an entirely different logical order than energy systems do. So we will have to modify and supplement our thinking and our teaching on such matters as causality, summativity (the axiom that the whole is equal to the sum of all its parts), and the duality of all phenomena (those dichotomies that we are so fond of – mind/body, heredity/environment, man/nature, thought/expression). We can get our retraining for the computer age, Coe proposes, from such disciplines as quantum physics, gestalt psychology, cybernetics, and general-systems theory – not from formal study of these disciplines, of course, but from what filters down from these disciplines in terms that the layman can understand. This was a very exciting essay for me, and I urge you to read it when it is published. Chaim Perelman's great book *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argument* is also a revolt against the positivistic mode of thinking that the Western world inherited from Descartes, as is Wayne Booth's forthcoming book *Modern Dogma and the Rhetoric of Assent*. (As an aside, I hope that Wayne Booth will find an outlet for his paper "B. F. Skinner's Rhetorical Theory" that he prepared for my forum on rhetorical theory at the Midwest MLA meeting last November.)

You may have noted that I have not said anything yet about "symbols of inducement" other than the verbal ones. One reason for

that silence is that the contemporary rhetoricians I have been talking about have not said much directly, in their books and articles, on the other media of communication. But I see no reason why much of the new theory they have developed could not be applied to the study of films, cartoons, comic strips, records, and advertising. For the theory about these other media of inducement, we have to go to that maverick rhetorician of the twentieth century, Marshall McLuhan. And if one is to judge from the articles in their journals, speech teachers seem to be doing more theorizing about the rhetoric of the audio-visual media than English teachers are. Where I get the hint that English teachers may be dealing in the classroom with the rhetoric of the audio-visual media is from some of the freshman readers that have been appearing recently, such as *Popular Writing in America: The Interaction of Style and Audience*, ed. Donald McQuade and Robert Atwan (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974) and *The Age of Communication*, ed. William D. Lutz (Pacific Palisades, Calif.: Goodyear Publishing Co., 1974). In addition to prose essays, anthologies like these carry cartoons, comic strips, ads, photographs, paintings, collages, and the musical stories, as well as the lyrics, of popular songs.

And there is evidence too that English teachers are leading their students to study the rhetoric of the small units of the language of inducement. No NCTE committee in recent years has received as much notice in the public press as the Committee on Public Doublespeak has received lately. Several of the more active members of this committee have been directing their attention mainly to the exposure of the jargon, the euphemism, or the deceptiveness to be found in phrases or single sentences from public utterances. Two anthologies of public doublespeak have already appeared, Robert Cirino's *Power to Persuade: Mass Media and the News* (New York: Bantam, 1974) and Mario Pei's *Double-Speak in America* (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1973), and at least two more are in preparation. The mood of young people has been so soured by events connected with the Vietnam War and the Watergate affair that the time may be propitious for us to lead them to a serious and intensive study of how language is being used to falsify and to obfuscate. But before we can do that, we will have to clean our own house of some of the worst examples of academic English.

In the May 1974 issue of *College Composition and Communication*, I am publishing an article by Frank D'Angelo in which he analyzes current examples of graffiti from the point of view of the classical schemes and tropes. The lead article in the May 1974

issue of *Esquire* is Norman Mailer's "The Faith of Graffiti" in which the author discusses the social significance of the flamboyant graffiti painted on walls, buses, and subway cars in New York City. I know of teachers who are having fun studying campaign buttons, bumper stickers, advertising slogans, and the drawings and slogans on T-shirts. That some teachers are giving attention in the classroom to these one-liners may indicate that they have been convinced by Marshall McLuhan's claim that in this electronic age a good deal of persuasion is being conducted, not in the discursive, linear, protracted monologue of former years but in the fragmentary, non-sequential, mosaic modes of discourse.

When one is disposed to see will-o-the-wisps, he will see will-o-the-wisps. And I do not dismiss the possibility that I see a good deal of significant rhetorical activity on the current scene because I am disposed to see it. Someone else, oriented in a different way, might view the same phenomena as social or political or religious or cultural movements. But while I grant sociologists, psychologists, philosophers, and anthropologists the right to view these phenomena from their perspective, I want also to be granted the privilege to view these phenomena from the point of view of a rhetorician — that is, as instances of how man uses and is used by symbols of inducement. That is an honorable occupation for the only symbol-using creature on the face of the earth to be engaged in. And I hope I have presented some evidence that a number of honorable, intelligent, serious-minded symbol-using creatures are engaged in this honorable occupation. Because the quality of the men and women currently engaged in rhetorical studies—many of them working in nooks and crannies, far from the madding crowd—and the quality of thought that is emerging from those studies, I am confident that rhetoric will make a go of it in the coming years. The crucial, unanswered question at the moment is whether the great masses of our citizens are prepared to go along with rhetoric. We must induce them to come along for the exciting ride.

Edward P. J. Corbett
Ohio State University

Notes

[1]The participants in the Symposium in Rhetoric, besides Professor Corbett, were Winston Weathers, Turner Kobler, James R. Bennett, and Gary Tate. (The Editors)

[2]See the two recent articles in *College English*, 35 (April, 1974): Tim Shopen, "Some Contributions from Grammar to the Theory of Style," pp. 775-98; Eugene R. Kintgen, "Is Transformational Stylistics Useful?" pp. 799-824.

[3]See Paul Newell Campbell, "A Rhetorical View of Locutionary, Illocutionary, and Perlocutionary Acts," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 59 (October, 1973), 284-96.

[4]See for instance the following articles by Richard Ohmann: "Generative Grammars and the Concept of Literary Style," *Word*, 20 (1964), 424-39; "Literature as Sentences," *College English*, 27 (1966), 261-67; "Speech Acts and the Definition of Literature," *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 4 (1971), 1-19; "Speech Action and Style," *Literary Style: A Symposium*, ed. Seymour Chatman (New York, 1971), pp. 241-54; "Instrumental Style: Notes on the Theory of Speech as Action," *Current Trends in Stylistics*, ed. Braj Kachru and Herbert F. W. Stahlke (Champagne, Ill., 1972), pp. 115-41.

[5]See Chapter 4, "The Subject: Generating a Topic," *The Holt Guide to English: A Contemporary Handbook of Rhetoric, Language, and Literature* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1972), pp. 27-38.

[6]"Discovery Through Questioning: A Plan for Teaching Rhetorical Invention," *College English*, 30 (November, 1968), 126-34.

[7]"The Grammar of Coherence," *College English*, 31 (May, 1970), 828-35.